

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT UTAH STATE OFFICE LAND USE PLAN EVALUATION REPORT		Date: September 2015
Plan Title: Moab Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan		
Periodic Evaluation Number: I		
Dates Conducted: July 9, 2015		
Conducted By: BLM, Utah State Office		
TEAM MEMBERS		
Name	Title	
Julie Carson	Planning and Environmental Specialist Utah State Office	
Skye Sieber	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Utah State Office	
Assistance Provided by:		
Rebecca Doolittle	Planning and Environmental Coordinator Canyon Country District	
Beth Ransel	Field Manager Moab Field Office	
Submitted by:	Date	
Moab Field Office	September 30, 2015	

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	3
1.1.	Purpose	3
1.2.	Methodology.....	3
1.3.	Plan Amendments and Maintenance	4
2.	Results by Resource Topic.....	4
2.1.	Air, Water and Soil Resources.....	4
2.2.	Cultural and Paleontological Resources.....	5
2.3.	Fish, Wildlife and Special Status Species.....	5
2.4.	Fire, Forests, and Vegetation	6
2.5.	Lands and Realty	6
2.6.	Livestock Grazing	6
2.7.	Mining, Energy, and Health and Safety.....	6
2.8.	Recreation and Travel Management	7
2.9.	Visual Resources and Special Designations	7
3.	Current Initiatives	7
3.1.	Renewable Energy.....	7
3.2.	Priority Corridors.....	7
3.3.	Leasing Reform.....	7
3.4.	Climate Change	8
3.5.	Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation	8
3.6.	Regional Mitigation	8
4.	Recommendations.....	8
4.1.	Implementation-Level Planning	8
4.2.	Data and Effectiveness Monitoring.....	9
4.3.	Maintaining Plan Updates.....	9
4.4.	Summary of Plan Maintenance and Amendments	9

Appendix A: Interdisciplinary Review Team

Appendix B: Evaluation Questions and Responses

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

1. Introduction

In October 2008, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) signed a Record of Decision (ROD) for the Moab Field Office Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP). Prior to the 2008 plan revision, the Moab Field Office managed resources under the 1985 Grand Resource Area RMP and amendments. In 2002, the Grand Resource Area RMP was evaluated and found to require a plan revision. The 2008 RMP provides guidance for the management of over 1,821,000 acres of public land and 1,850,000 acres of Federal mineral estate administered by the BLM in Grand and San Juan Counties in southeastern Utah.

1.1. Purpose

BLM planning regulations require established intervals and standards for monitoring and evaluation of plans (43 CFR 1610.4-9). The BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.) articulates these intervals and standards:

Evaluation is the process of reviewing the land use plan and the periodic plan monitoring reports to determine whether the land use plan decisions and NEPA analysis are still valid and whether the plan is being implemented. Land use plans are evaluated to determine if: (1) decisions remain relevant to current issues; (2) decisions are effective in achieving (or making progress toward achieving) desired outcomes; (3) any decisions need to be revised; (4) any decisions need to be dropped from their consideration; and (5) any areas require new decisions. [T]he plan should be periodically evaluated (at a minimum every 5 years) as documented in an evaluation schedule.

This report is the first periodic evaluation of the Moab RMP and fulfills BLM's duties under 43 CFR 1610.4-9. Based on workload in the field office, BLM's Washington Office granted an extension for completion of the first periodic evaluation for the Moab RMP from Fiscal Year 2013 to Fiscal Year 2015 (September 30, 2015). The subsequent evaluations will take place every five years.

1.2. Methodology

The RMP evaluation team included Julie Carson (Utah State Office) and Skye Sieber (Utah State Office), with coordination and support provided by Rebecca (Becky) Doolittle (Canyon Country District Office). The team met at the Moab Field Office in Moab, Utah on July 9, 2015, to conduct interviews with field office staff. Resource specialists who helped review and evaluate the RMP are listed in Appendix A. A close-out conference call with Moab Field Office managers was held on September 8, 2015.

The Utah State Office developed questions to evaluate the effectiveness, consistency, and conformance of the plan with regard to current BLM policies and initiatives. The evaluation questions, along with field office staff responses, are attached in Appendix B. The results are summarized in Section 2 of this report. Recent policies and initiatives considered in this periodic evaluation include:

- Renewable energy;
- Priority corridors;
- Leasing reform;
- Climate change;
- Sage-grouse habitat conservation; and
- Regional mitigation.

Additionally, the State Office compiled all management decisions from the RMP into a spreadsheet to facilitate a systematic review of each decision. Responses from this review (attached in Appendix C) informed recommendations for plan maintenance or amendments.

The evaluation questions and spreadsheet were sent to the field office manager and resource specialists prior to the evaluation team's visit in Moab. The questionnaires and subsequent interviews address the evaluation process outlined in the BLM land use planning handbook (H-1601-1, V.B.1.).

1.3. Plan Amendments and Maintenance

Since October 2008, the Moab RMP has been amended by the following planning efforts and environmental impact statements (EISs):

- Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Designation of Energy Corridors on Bureau of Land Management-Administered Lands in the 11 Western States (January 2009);¹ and
- Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments/Record of Decision (ROD) for Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States (October 2012).

Additionally, 41 maintenance actions have been completed and can be found on the Moab Field Office webpage with the Approved RMP.

2. Results by Resource Topic

The main findings of the evaluation are summarized below by resource topics. Appendix B contains detailed responses from field office specialists to evaluation questions; Appendix C contains responses from specialists for each decision in the RMP.

2.1. Air, Water and Soil Resources

Under air, water, and soil resources, some evaluation questions ask if the RMP has specifically addressed a current policy or best management practice. In many cases, these are not specifically addressed in the RMP, but staff have developed implementation-level best management practices or cooperative agreements to address these needs. For example, the RMP does not specifically address the use of Ecological Site Descriptions (ESDs) for determining site conditions and treatment options, but ESDs are routinely used as a best management practice. Similarly, the RMP does not specifically evaluate the availability of water with the plan area for fire suppression or other emergency needs, but local agreements have been established to maintain availability of water for fire suppression. Under air quality, the Moab RMP uses the a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed in 2011 that provides direction on Federal oil and gas decisions made through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process,² even though the RMP predates the MOU. Furthermore, Moab's Master Leasing Plan, when finalized, may amend timing limitation stipulations for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities in order to protect sensitive soils on slopes and to protect saline soils in the Mancos Shale.

Since BLM does not have jurisdiction over air quality standards, its air quality decisions focus on maintaining compliance with standards set by the Utah Division of Air Quality. In the Moab area, no areas are currently in nonattainment of air quality standards.

¹ The ROD included the note that Moab's RMP contains statements that the ROW corridor designation decisions presented in the RMP are consistent with the PEIS Proposed Action. Since this RMP is consistent with the PEIS, further amendment of this RMP is not necessary.

² U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of the Interior, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2011 Memorandum of Understanding among the U.S. Department of Agriculture, U.S. Department of the Interior, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Regarding Air Quality Analyses and Mitigation for Federal Oil and Gas Decisions through the National Environmental Policy Act Process. <http://www.doi.gov/news/pressreleases/upload/29704-Joint-MOU-Air-Quality-FINAL.pdf> June 2011.

A decision for riparian health, RIP-18, notes that “Castle Valley will also not be available for grazing.” This decision is accurate, but will not be fully implemented until an existing grazing permit in Castle Valley expires (see Section 2.3).

Finally, Watershed Management Plans have not yet been completed; more funding is needed to undertake such planning efforts.

2.2. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

Most of the decisions for cultural decisions in the RMP are based on a literature search and predictive model. The BLM has recently contracted for a Class I Cultural Resources Inventory for the planning area. Once completed, the field office will review the Class I Inventory and consider whether the new information warrants inclusion in the RMP through a plan amendment.

Under Paleontological Resources, the MFO would like to consider prohibiting petrified wood collection in the Cedar Mountain Formation wood localities in the Yellow Cat/Cisco area due to over collection of conifer and yellow cat redwood specimens. Staff would also like to manage Willow Springs, Mill Canyon, and Dinosaur Stomping Grounds Track Sites as important scientific and public education resources as guided by future SRMA activity-level plans. Under PAL-12, staff would like to propose closing or limiting the amount of plant fossils that can be collected at the Naturita Plant Site located in the Westwater area because they are being over collected and illegally sold.

2.3. Fish, Wildlife and Special Status Species

In 2014, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listed both the western yellow-billed cuckoo and the Gunnison sage-grouse as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. Neither species has yet undergone Section 7 consultation, a process that is likely to be completed on a statewide level. The RMP will need to be updated to incorporate identified critical habitats for both species, as well as to establish strategies for no net loss. Furthermore, the Moab RMP will be amended through the Gunnison Sage Grouse Rangewide EIS, a planning effort that was initiated in July 2014. The RMP could also benefit from the addition of decisions to protect the Navajo sedge, a plant species that has been listed as threatened since 1985. These decisions were inadvertently omitted from the RMP.

Similarly, Utah’s Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR) has adjusted the identified extent of habitats for pronghorn and bighorn sheep lambing, and those extents have not yet been incorporated into the RMP. In 2012, a maintenance action³ was filed to specify in SSS-31 that surface disturbing activities are precluded within 200 meters of *occupied* kit fox dens, but that change has not yet been incorporated into the current version of the RMP. Other recommendations for changes to the Fish, Wildlife, and Special Status Species sections include harmonizing the field office Geographic Information System (GIS) shapefiles of habitat extents with those of DWR and updating nesting season for migratory birds from May 1 to April 1, based on USFWS recommendations. Climate adaptation for threatened and endangered species, such as keeping pathways open for movement to refugia, has not yet been considered in the RMP.

Finally, a recent land exchange in Castle Valley between the State of Utah and the BLM resulted in a new

³ Maintenance Action 34, January 24, 2012.

http://www.blm.gov/style/medialib/blm/ut/moab_fo/rmp/rod_approved_rmp.Par.66676.File.dat/MoabPlanMaintenanceForms.pdf

BLM grazing allotment. This area, the Round Mountain Allotment, previously had a grazing permit issued by the State. Because the land exchange agreement recognizes all valid, existing rights, grazing is allowed to continue until the permit expires (estimated by 2026). As a result, RMP decisions like WL-43, which state that “all forage on acquired state lands in upper Castle Valley within crucial deer winter range will be allocated to deer,” will not be fully implemented until the valid, existing grazing permit expires.

2.4. Fire, Forests, and Vegetation

Modifications to the RMP under Fire, Forests, and Vegetation focus on forests and woodlands. While the specific decisions for forestlands are sufficient, staff would like to add decisions that:

- Support the identification of desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources, broken down by forest type;
- Address old-growth features of the forest and woodland habitat types, including management direction on how to maintain or contribute to the restoration of old growth forests;
- Identify characteristics of healthy forest conditions for forest and woodland types; and
- Support the utilization of biomass across broad landscapes.

2.5. Lands and Realty

Staff noted that maintenance actions to update some Lands and Realty decisions to include specific references to BLM’s Solar PEIS would be helpful. In addition, LAR-12, a decision that focuses on surface occupation stipulations within the Three Rivers and Westwater Mineral Withdrawals, may be amended by the Moab MLP.

2.6. Livestock Grazing

Decisions related to livestock grazing are currently meeting the needs of the Moab Field Office. One grazing allotment has been added since 2008; see Section 2.3, Fish, Wildlife, and Special Status Species, for details on the existing grazing permit.

In addition, the staff recommends that one area, Floy Creek, be added to the group of allotments that will be treated to increase forage for livestock and wildlife use.

2.7. Mining, Energy, and Health and Safety

The Canyon Country District Office has initiated a planning effort to prepare the Moab Master Leasing Plan (MLP), a plan which will amend oil, gas, and potash leasing in a portion of the Moab Field Office. See Section 3.3, Leasing Reform, for more information on the Moab MLP. In 2016, the Cisco Desert MLP will be initiated to reconsider leasing stipulations for that portion of the planning area.

Under Minerals decisions, staff would like to see Appendix A (A.1.4) updated to be more reflective of current agency BMPs.

Regarding hazardous waste decisions, staff have identified that existing decisions are sufficient, but additional information is needed for hydraulic fracturing, based on the Interior Department’s final rule for hydraulic fracturing on Federal and Indian Lands.⁴ The Moab MLP will also analyze hydraulic fracturing in the Moab MLP planning area.

⁴ *Hydraulic Fracturing on Federal and Indian Lands*, 43 CFR Part 3160, <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2015-03-26/pdf/2015-06658.pdf>.

2.8. Recreation and Travel Management

Visitation has increased dramatically – especially motorized use – in the Moab Field Office since the RMP was completed in 2008. To address the increased pressure on existing areas, travel management and resource protection measures are being implemented at an enhanced rate, when staffing allows. Construction of recreation facilities such as campgrounds, trailheads and trails is a priority.

2.9. Visual Resources and Special Designations

In the RMP, Special Designations include Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wild and Scenic Rivers, National Trails and Backways, Designated Wilderness, and Wilderness Study Areas. For the purposes of this review, Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics (“BLM Natural Areas”) are included in this section.

An updated Visual Resources Inventory (VRI) was completed for the Moab Field Office in 2011 and has not yet been considered in a resource management plan amendment. This is particularly relevant in determining whether the existing constraints imposed by the VRM classes are appropriate for protecting sensitive resources and managing development. Resource specialists noted that in areas of current heavy recreation use, the VRM class may no longer be adequate, and a plan amendment to consider this new VRI may be appropriate. Similarly, the MFO has completed nine specific inventories for wilderness characteristics in response to new information, and has comprehensively reviewed all roadless areas in the field office. To consider this new information in the RMP, the field office would need to initiate a plan amendment.

3. Current Initiatives

Since the RMP was completed in 2008, BLM has undertaken several new initiatives on public lands. The RMP’s treatment of these initiatives is summarized in this section.

3.1. Renewable Energy

For renewable energy, the Approved RMP Amendments / ROD for Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States (2012) designated 587 acres in the Moab Field Office as a variance area, making that area potentially available for utility-scale solar energy development outside of a solar energy zone. This information has not yet been incorporated into the current RMP. The MFO was not mentioned in the 2005 Wind Energy Development Programmatic EIS, and the Moab RMP was not proposed for amendment in the Geothermal Resources Leasing Programmatic EIS. Similarly, the RMP does not specifically incorporate the Solar Energy Development Policy (IM 2007-09 updated to IM 2011-003 and extended to 9/30/15) or the Department of Energy and BLM joint policy on Assessing the Potential for Renewable Energy on Public Lands, but LAR-10 and LAR-11 address the authorization of solar energy development in rights-of-way according to best management practices.

3.2. Priority Corridors

The RMP is currently meeting the field office’s needs and current policies with regards to orderly corridor planning, accommodation of existing, compatible, proposed, and/or new uses, appropriate width, and habitat sustainability.

3.3. Leasing Reform

The Canyon Country District Office has initiated a planning effort to prepare the Moab Master Leasing

Plan (MLP), a plan which will amend oil, gas, and potash leasing in a portion of the Moab Field Office. The outcome of the MLP process may result in new mineral leasing stipulations and development constraints accomplished through amendments to Moab's RMP. The Moab MLP and Draft RMP Amendments / Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were made available in August 2015; an anticipated date for the Final EIS is not yet known. The MLP has developed a Reasonably Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for potash that covers the area where the Moab Field Office has most of its pending potash permit applications. This new plan will impact various decisions in the Moab RMP that are tied to oil, gas, and potash leasing decisions; therefore, adjustments to decisions in this section will take place after the MLP has been completed. In 2016, the Cisco Desert MLP will be initiated to reconsider leasing stipulations for that portion of the planning area.

3.4. Climate Change

The RMP's treatment of climate change effects and adaptation measures on natural resources is limited to climate adaptation measures specific to drought (VEG-15). The RMP does not recognize the 2009 BLM Air Quality Manual (MS 7300) or assess climate change as required by Departmental Management 523 DM1 (December 2012). The RMP addresses greenhouse gas emissions qualitatively. Here, the Moab Field Office may find it beneficial to directly address climate change adaptation measures, specifically for anticipated changes in habitat or acquisition of lands for habitat and landscape resilience. Secretarial Order 3289 references the Department's need to continue its work "identifying areas where carbon dioxide can be safely stored underground," and requests that field offices complete an inventory of carbon sequestration potential as evidenced by applications to explore or develop. There have not yet been any such applications in the Moab Field Office; therefore, no inventories of carbon sequestration potential have been completed.

3.5. Sage-Grouse Habitat Conservation

As noted in Section 2.3, decisions relating to Gunnison Sage-Grouse may be amended by BLM's Gunnison Sage-Grouse planning effort, which began in 2014 and has not yet been completed.

3.6. Regional Mitigation

BLM Manual 1794 on Regional Mitigation is still in draft form; to date, the Moab RMP has not identified priority areas for mitigation.

4. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the evaluation, the evaluation team has summarized plan maintenance and identified actions that can further implement RMP objectives and decisions.

4.1. Implementation-Level Planning

In order to ensure that goals and objectives are met, the following implementation-level plans still need to be completed:

- Watershed Management Plans (SOL-WAT-29);
- Recreation Area Management Plan for Lower Gray Canyon SRMA (REC-40); and
- Management plans for culturally sensitive areas (CUL-14).

The Moab Field Office also maintains a spreadsheet that prioritizes implementation-level actions from the RMP. However, most progress is document as "ongoing" or "as needed." To better ensure that the appropriate staff and budget are allocated to outstanding commitments, staff should update the

spreadsheet or develop a better tool to help track RMP implementation accomplishments and outstanding commitments.

4.2. Data and Effectiveness Monitoring

Appendix E includes a monitoring section for each resource to describe how decisions will be tracked. There were no suggested updates to the language within each resource's monitoring section, except to remove a reference to an area on the west side of Lost Spring Canyon, which was part of Maintenance Action #40 and has not yet been incorporated into the current version of the RMP.

4.3. Maintaining Plan Updates

Over the life of the RMP, changes to language and decisions in the RMP are documented on LUP (Land Use Plan) amendment/maintenance sheets. An LUP amendment/maintenance sheet is needed to document allocations and decisions resulting from the Approved RMP Amendments / ROD for Solar Energy Development in Six Southwestern States (see Section 1.3). Updated text attributed to amendments and plan maintenance is not reflected in the body of the RMP. To help ensure that BLM staff are referring to the most up-to-date RMP language, the Moab Field Office should maintain an electronic "redline" or annotated version of the plan that clearly shows these changes. The annotated RMP should also be published to the Field Office webpage to further ensure that BLM staff in other offices, as well as interested publics, are referencing the most current plan language.

Some changes submitted on maintenance forms before the Plan's Maintenance Version 1 (February 2009) were inadvertently omitted from that updated version, and other changes since that time have not yet been incorporated. These include maintenance change numbers 1, 13A, 14, 20, 24, and 26 – 41.

4.4. Summary of Plan Maintenance and Amendments

The following table summarizes updates to the plan recommended by field office staff and the evaluation team during their review. A majority of updates are likely to be accomplished by plan maintenance as they reflect minor data changes or help to refine, document, or clarify previously approved decisions. While the appropriate method for incorporating changes must be determined from the details of each case, an initial suggestion regarding plan maintenance or amendment is provided.

Suggested Change	Affected Decision(s)	Suggested Method
Acreages need to be adjusted to reflect acquired lands from the Federal Recreational Land Exchange	Throughout the RMP	Maintenance
Replace: <i>"Class III inventory and compliance with Section 106, focused on areas where adverse effects are likely to occur, is required prior to designation"</i> with: <i>"reasonable and good faith efforts to identify historic properties will be undertaken in accordance with current regulatory requirements, NHPA agreements, and bureau policy."</i>	CUL-9	Maintenance
Modify decision to match bureau policy: <i>Adverse effects to eligible cultural sites will be avoided, minimized and /or mitigated.</i>	CUL-11	Maintenance
Add: <i>education and/or before scientific</i>	CUL-17	Maintenance

Modify decision to improve clarity: <i>Lower Kane Springs Canyon and the Wall Street Rock Art District will be hardened and/or interpreted for public use.</i>	CUL-25	Maintenance
Update Fire Management Plan title: <i>Canyon Country Fire Zone.</i>	FIRE-1	Maintenance
Update term <i>wildland fire use</i> to <i>use of wildland fire</i> (as per NWCG. Oct. 2014. Glossary of Wildland Fire Terminology PMS 205).	FIRE-12, 13, 14	Maintenance
Replace <i>IMP</i> with <i>BLM MS-6330 and MS-6340</i>	LAR-1	Maintenance
Consider adding reference to Solar Energy PEIS.	LAR-10 and 11	Maintenance
File maintenance action to incorporate 587 acres of solar variance area from Solar PEIS (2012) into RMP.	Where applicable.	Maintenance
Add <i>Cattleguard</i> after <i>Hittle Bottom</i> for clarity.	GRA-4; RIP-15; WL-2	Maintenance
Add language from state land exchange to this decision re: Round Mtn Allotment (acquisition).	GRA-4; RIP-18; WL-42 and 43	Maintenance
Remove: <i>Harley Dome</i> . Add: <i>Little Hole</i> .	GRA-5 and 19; WL-22 and 25	Maintenance
Remove phrase: <i>or otherwise mechanically treated</i>	GRA-11	Maintenance
Update AUMs and acres	GRA-13, 14, 15	Maintenance
Modify last sentence to read: <i>This will reduce acreage in the allotments and will reduce the AUMs.</i>	GRA-16	Maintenance
Add <i>Floy Creek</i> to allotment list and update acreage accordingly	GRA-21	Maintenance
Add: <i>Moab Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action (UMTRA) project</i> to list of areas.	MIN-10	Maintenance
Add: <i>Leasable Minerals</i> sub-heading	MIN-11	Maintenance
Update all references to the <i>IMP</i> to the new <i>BLM MS-6330</i> (Management of Wilderness Study Areas).	MIN-21; REC-49; ACEC-1, 3 4, 6; WSA-1, 3, 4, 6; TRV-1, 15	Maintenance
As per the ROD (p. 28), add “ <i>(BLM natural areas)</i> ” wherever “ <i>non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics</i> ” is mentioned.	WC-1 and 2; TRV-13	Maintenance
Change <i>Old Spanish Trail</i> to <i>Old Spanish National Historic Trail</i> .	REC-35; TRA-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	
Replace: “ <i>on 303(d) listed streams, currently Mill, Castle, and Onion Creeks</i> ” with <i>on current 303(d) and 305(b) listed streams.</i>	SOL-WAT-10	Maintenance
Replace: “ <i>to WO IM 2007-021</i> ” with <i>most current policy.</i>	SOL-WAT-13; SSS-19	Maintenance
Ensure that BMPs identified in the RMP are reflective of the most current agency BMPs.	SOL-WAT-13, 21	Maintenance
Add: <i>subject to leases with valid, existing rights</i>	WSA-2	Maintenance
Change: “ <i>limited to designated routes...with no designated routes</i> ” to <i>closed.</i>	WSA-7	Maintenance
Add decision for Navajo Sedge (omission). Sample language: <i>In areas that are known or suspected to be habitat for Navajo Sedge actions would be avoided or restricted per the Standard Terms and</i>	Special Status Species (SSS)	Maintenance

<i>Conditions (Lease Notices) which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act (Appendix A, Table A4). Add Lease Notice language to Appendix A [see Monticello RMP Appendix B].</i>		
Specify best location of fence for White Wash Sand Dunes open area (update Map 30)	TRV-10	Maintenance
Change: <i>May 1 to April 1</i> based on latest FWS recommendations	WL-9	Maintenance
[To match Nov. 2014 DWR shape files]: Remove <i>Harley Dome, Squaw Park, and San Arroyo</i> (listed twice). Update La Sal WMU acres to <i>79,700</i> and <i>548,579</i> acres in Cisco. Update corresponding Map 32	WL-22 and Map 32	Maintenance
Update acres to match Nov 2014 DWR shape files: <i>622,280</i>	WL-24	Maintenance
Update acres to <i>543,189</i>	WL-25	Maintenance
Add: <i>or most current guidance</i>	WL-29	Maintenance
Update Lockhart Bighorn Sheep area to match 2013 DWR shape files.	WL-32	Maintenance
Update lambing/rutting area to match 2013 DWR shape files: <i>107,220</i> acres.	WL-36 and 37	Maintenance
Update Map 9 to match 2013 DWR shape files.	Map 9	Maintenance
Add language: <i>Reserved Federal interests in split estate lands anywhere in the planning area may be considered for conveyance out of Federal ownership [per IM 2011-110: Conveyance of Reversionary Interests]</i>	Appendix G	Maintenance
Consider adding language that would support the goals identified in Section 2.4.	Forestlands	Maintenance
Add Willow Springs, Mill Canyon, and Dinosaur Stomping Ground Track Sites.	PAL-11	Maintenance
Update once Yellow-Billed Cuckoo Recovery Plan is available.	SSS-7, 9, 33	Known Future Maintenance
Update once Gunnison Sage-Grouse Plan is finished.	SSS-7 and 9	Known Future Maintenance
Decisions may be amended by the Moab MLP. Revisit when the Record of the Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.	LAR-12; MIN-4, 9, 14, 16, 19; SOL-WAT-9, 27; VRM-12	Known Future Maintenance
Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after MLP and update as needed.	WL-27, 28, 32, 33, 36, 37	Possible Future Maintenance
<i>There is no requirement or commitment for the MFO to undertake changes that could only be enacted through the amendment process.</i>		
Consider new VRI in plan.	Throughout	Amendment
Consider new wilderness characteristics inventories	Throughout	Amendment

in plan.		
Consider prohibiting petrified wood gathering in the Cedar Mountain Formation Wood localities in the Yellow Cat / Cisco areas due to over collecting of conifer and yellow cat redwood.	PAL-8	Amendment

Appendix A: Interdisciplinary Review Team

Moab Field Office / Canyon Country District Staff

Kim Allison	<i>Range</i>
Ann Marie Aubry	<i>Hydrology</i>
Jordan Davis	<i>Range</i>
Rebecca (Becky) Doolittle	<i>Planning</i>
Eric Jones	<i>Minerals</i>
Karinne Knutsen	<i>Hydrology</i>
Michael Lundell	<i>Cultural/Paleontology</i>
Donald Montoya	<i>Cultural/Paleontology</i>
Pam Riddle	<i>Wildlife</i>
Jeffrey (Rock) Smith	<i>Recreation</i>
Bill Stevens	<i>Recreation</i>
Katy Stevens	<i>Recreation</i>
Josh Relph	<i>Fire and Fuels</i>
Jason Kirks	<i>Fire and Fuels</i>

Appendix B: Evaluation Questions and Responses

Question	Response	Action
Are the leasing restrictions and stipulations affecting energy and renewable energy development (Oil & Gas, Geothermal, Solar, and Wind) appropriate to protect critical resources and special areas or are there additional restrictions or stipulations that are needed to protect resources? Identify the additional restrictions required.	Yes. The leasing stipulations apply to all surface disturbing activities within the field office and contain exception, modification and waiver language. The Moab MLP is underway for a portion of the planning area to reconsider stipulations for that portion of the planning area, and in 2016 the Cisco Desert MLP will be initiated to reconsider leasing stipulations for that portion of the planning area.	No Change
Is there a Reasonable Foreseeable Development (RFD) scenario for implementing fluid minerals energy-related exploration and development in the planning area? If so, then:	Yes	No Change
a. Is it appropriate for the level of activity occurring now and projected in the near term (3-5 years)?	Yes	No Change
b. Is it appropriate for the level of activity projected in the long term (20 years)?	Yes	No Change
c. Has the RFD been exceeded or could be exceeded within the lifespan of the RMP?	No	No Change
d. Does the RFD consider potential new discoveries from developing tight shale formations with new hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling technologies?	No. However, the MLP will amend the RMP for a large part of the Moab Field Office and will analyze hydraulic fracturing. This, however, will only include the MLP planning area.	No Change
e. Was the RFD used as the basis for determining cumulative impacts in the RMP/EIS?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain an appendix outlining typical BMPs that will be used for fluid mineral development?	Yes, Appendix A (A.1.4) includes a minimal list of BMPs, though it would benefit from being updated to be more reflective of current agency BMPs. The Moab MLP will amend the RMP for a large part of the Moab Field Office and will include BMPs that apply to the Moab MLP planning area only. As needed, BMPs are included in implementation/development EAs.	Revise
Were the least restrictive constraints selected that meet the resources protection objective?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide direction and flexibility to accommodate oil & gas and renewable energy development?		
Are there constraints in the RMP that would affect or delay issuing Rights-of-Way for oil & gas, geothermal, wind or solar energy development?	Yes, the RMP provides direction and flexibility. No, there are no constraints that would cause delays.	No Change
Are there restrictions that should be eliminated or modified because they no longer are needed/appropriate, or are there other protective mechanisms in place that supersede their use, or are there industry technological changes that make the restriction(s) unnecessary?	No. The stipulations in place are adequate.	No Change
Are there RFDs outlined in the RMP for other mineral resources, such as locatable or salable? If so, is level of activity commensurate with the RFD?	No, however the MLP has an RFD for potash that covers the area where the Moab Field Office has all of its pending potash permit applications. The MLP will amend the Moab RMP appropriately.	No Change
Does the RMP address how the RFD scenario(s) will be kept up to date?	No, but the estimates made in the RFD appear to be holding true, and the MLP area where we could see more potential development, has an updated RFD that will become part of the MLP amendment.	No Change
Does the RMP describe criteria for the application of appropriate stipulations for fluid minerals, along with criteria for the waiver, exception, or modification of the stipulation?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate sustainable development concepts or objectives relative to post-mining uses?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP ensure access to sand and gravel to support infrastructure and communities?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	N/A: There are no specific Minerals Monitoring requirements.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing hazardous materials and wastes up to date?	May need to be updated with information on fracking, once rule is finalized and guidance is provided.	No Change
Does the RMP identify an inventory of hazardous materials sites, including FUD (Formerly Used Defense) sites, and outline objectives for management and disposal of known or potential future hazardous materials sites?	No. However, the Moab Field Office has no formerly used defense sites. Hazardous materials are managed through policies and guidance.	No Change
Is the RMP's policy statement for managing Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) up to date?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP address identification, inventory and closure actions for Abandoned Mine Lands?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Health and Safety monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Do the RMP land tenure decisions provide for consolidating land ownership? If no, please explain.	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP include a Table or Map identifying Land and Mineral Ownership in the Planning Area, or something comparable, clearly identifying jurisdiction over various lands or interests in lands?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify specific lands, described by legal description as potentially suitable for disposal by sale or exchange? Does the RMP identify acquisition areas such as NCAs, wilderness areas, or other high resource lands, should they become available from a willing seller? Do these areas reflect current resource priorities for landownership adjustments (i.e. sage grouse habitat, mule deer winter range, etc.)? List any new priority areas not described in the RMP.	Yes	No Change
How are planning decisions in the RMP being applied to newly-acquired lands? Is future BLM management of the lands or interests in lands addressed in the EIS for the acquisition/exchange?	Yes and Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify right-of-way corridors, avoidance areas, and exclusion areas? For avoidance areas, does the plan outline the terms and conditions that must be met in order for a right-of-way to be granted?	Yes and Yes	No Change
Does the RMP address the policies and actions under Executive Order (EO) 13211 of May 18, 2001 (President's National Energy Policy) toward expediting the supply and availability of energy in your RMP area?	Yes: MIN-12.	No Change
Does the RMP identify proposed land withdrawals? Does the RMP identify both previous and new land withdrawals?	Yes	No Change
How are planning decisions being applied to lands returned to the public domain from relinquished withdrawals, where administrative jurisdiction is or will likely be returned to the BLM?	We have not had this situation arise yet since the ROD was signed.	No Change
Monitoring	N/A: There are no specific Lands and Realty Monitoring requirements.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify air quality standards and, if appropriate, provide examples of prescriptive management practices to achieve them?	Appendix J of RMP - includes mitigation strategies.	No Change
Does the RMP recognize the State's authority to regulate air quality impacts and establish emission standards?	Yes.	No Change
Does the RMP address impairment of visibility in federal and state Class I areas, including those which may be affected in adjacent states?	Yes. AQ-5, pg 52 of RMP.	No Change
Does the RMP identify existing non-attainment areas, state implementation plans (SIP), tribal implementation plans (TIP) when available, and measures/actions to meet conformity with SIP/TIPs?	No. The areas within the Moab Field Office are in attainment.	No Change
Was air quality modeling done for the RMP? If so, was the modeling qualitative or quantitative? Briefly describe the model used.	Dispersion modeling was not conducted because locations of oil and gas wells could not be determined at the programmatic planning level. AP-42 Fifth Edition methodology was employed to calculate total emissions from multiple sources i.e., compressors, flaring, fugitive dust, etc. (FEIS, p. 4-17).	No Change
Based upon the information derived from modeling and/or monitoring, are air quality standards being met? If not, what management actions or mitigation measures are prescribed?	Yes. Through project work.	No Change
Is the plan consistent with the June 2011 Air Quality MOU for Oil and Gas projects?	The 2008 plan predates the 2011 MOU. We do consider the MOU for oil and gas projects.	No Change
Monitoring	N/A: There are no specific Air Quality monitoring requirements.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water and/or the need to develop additional water sources needed to manage wild horses and burros, livestock, wildlife, recreation, habitat and other beneficial uses allowed under state water law?	SOL-WAT-18; WL-23, and SSS goals and objectives.	No Change
Does the RMP evaluate the availability of water within the plan area for fire suppression or other emergency needs?	No decisions in the RMP or FMP. Local agreements have been set up to maintain availability of water for fire suppression.	No Change
Does the RMP contain prescriptions for and identify methods of application(s) for emergency fire rehabilitation/restoration?	Not in the RMP, but the FMP considered this.	No Change
Does the RMP identify Bureau water rights policy, voluntary conformance with state water law, and provisions to perfect and protect sufficient water rights to meet land management activities (BLM 7250 Manual and Utah Water Rights Policy)?	Not specifically. Recognition of water rights and adhering to applicable state laws were part of planning criteria (FEIS, p. 1-10). BLM acknowledges it cannot hold instream water flow rights in Utah but can protect senior water rights as needed (p. 3-128). Management Actions SOL-WAT-1, 4, 18 and WSR-9 address conformance with state water law and to protect sufficient rights to meet land management activities.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Soils/Water monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP discuss water quality, water quantity, and current or foreseeable beneficial uses in the planning area?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify State water quality standards or establish water quality objectives where State standards are nonexistent? (BLM 7240 manual).	SOL-WAT-1 requires compliance with all State, Federal, and local laws to protect municipal watersheds and watersheds of any public or private water supply.	No Change
Does the RMP identify area wide use restrictions and/or Best Management Practices to meet water quality requirements?	Yes	No Change
Are there any impaired water bodies in the planning area identified on the State of Utah's list (303d)? Are any impaired water bodies linked to public land use?	Yes and yes. SOL-WAT-10	No Change
Does the RMP set objectives for the restoration of identified impaired waters?	Follow Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) recommendations on 303(d) listed streams, currently Mill, Castle, and Onion Creeks.	No Change
As appropriate, does the RMP refer to the state's Report on Water Quality (305b)?	Discussed in Chapter 3 of RMP EIS.	No Change
In view of the Unified Federal Policy and other provisions of the Clean Water Act, are there opportunities or needs to identify priority watersheds, or watersheds in need of special protection?	RMP identifies priority watersheds and those that need management plans.	No Change
Does the RMP recognize wellhead/source water protection areas and specify land-use restrictions to limit water quality degradation?	Yes, relative to public uses.	No Change
Are management decisions prescribed on a watershed level? Explain.	Yes: SOL-WAT-25 and 26. SOL-WAT-29 requires watershed management plans for additional areas.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Soils/Water monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP require the use of Proper Functioning Condition surveys to assess functionality of riparian areas? Yes		No Change
Are there general goals to maintain functional riparian areas at PFC and to improve the condition of areas that are functioning-at-risk or non-functional so that such areas may achieve PFC? Yes		No Change
Does the RMP include objectives/management actions needed to achieve goals described under #2 (actions might also be described under other management areas such as vegetation, soils, sensitive species, etc.)? Yes		No Change
Are measures required to collect quantitative monitoring data and additional PFC surveys to evaluate effectiveness of stated management actions?	RMP Monitoring (Appendix E) does not require collecting quantitative data. PFC assessments using the procedures outlined in BLM Tech. Ref. 1737-15 and 1737-16 are required. Also, follow Utah Riparian Policy.	No Change
Is the RMP subject to review under the new Riparian performance standard?	IM 2010-101 (Process for Reporting on the Performance Measure to Assess the Effectiveness of Resource Management Plans Using Riparian Condition as an Indicator) expired Sept. 30, 2011.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Riparian monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are soil survey data described and used to assess the suitability/capability of landscapes to achieve RMP objectives?	Yes	No Change
Are soil survey data used to set priorities for restoration/rehabilitation and to guide development of site-specific prescriptions?	Yes	No Change
Are soil survey data used to identify erosion hazards or erodible classes throughout the planning area?	Yes (VEG-15) and at a project level scale to help environmental analysis and make decisions.	No Change
Does the RMP utilize or address the use of Ecological Site Descriptions for determining ecological site conditions and treatment options?	The RMP doesn't, but using the Ecological Site Descriptions are used for project level analysis and decision. It is a best management practice that the office uses.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Soils/Water monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate direction and flexibility for the District/Field Office to plan and implement vegetation treatment projects under programs such as the Watershed Restoration Initiative (WRI) and Healthy Landscapes?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions of vegetation resources for land management objectives?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP designate priority plant species and habitats, including special status species and populations of plants? List any priority species and habitats.	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status plant species, including listed species and species proposed for listing?	Yes	No Change
Are the RMP decisions consistent with objectives and recommended actions in recovery plans, conservation agreements, and applicable biological opinions for threatened and endangered species?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide management direction to address the introduction and spread of noxious and invasive species?	Yes	No Change
Is there a current inventory of noxious or invasive species for the planning area?	Field Offices are not required to have complete systematic inventories for their offices; however, the RMP does discuss the inventory and monitoring of weed populations in Vegetation Goals and Objectives. We report targets and accomplishments associated with weed inventory and survey annually, consistent with state and national direction. We document areas that have been surveyed along with known populations of weeds.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Vegetation monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify desired future conditions for health and distribution of forest resources (broken down by forest type)?	No	Add
Does the RMP address old-growth features of the forest and woodland habitat types? Is management direction provided on how to maintain or contribute to the restoration of old growth forests?	In the Goals and Objectives section: "Identify, maintain, and restore forests with late successional characteristics to a pre-fire suppression condition. The MFO will adopt the USFS old-growth definitions and identification standards as per the USFS document 'Characteristics of Old-Growth Forests in the Intermountain Region (April 1993).' In instances where the area of application in the previous document does not apply (e.g., Pinus edulis), use the document 'Recommended Old-Growth Definitions and Descriptions, USDA Forest Service Southwestern Region (Sept. 1992).'"	Add
Does the RMP identify characteristics of healthy forest conditions for forest/woodland types?	No	Add
Does the RMP identify resources available for woodland product harvest and identify sustainable harvest levels in those areas?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify areas where commercial and/or non-commercial harvesting is open, restricted or withdrawn from commercial activities?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP comply with the objectives outlined in the Healthy Forest Initiative and the Healthy Forests Restoration Act?	Yes, under Vegetation decision.	No Change
Does the RMP support utilization of biomass across broad landscapes and is it consistent with policy?	RMP is silent.	Add
Monitoring	Verified that all Woodlands monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the plan provide adequate direction and flexibility to implement actions to maintain or restore healthy rangelands in Utah?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate the Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health for livestock grazing management? Does the RMP apply the standards to all programs and uses?	Yes, the RMP incorporates Utah Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health. Yes, the RMP applies the standards to all programs and uses.	No Change
Does the RMP identify lands available or not available for livestock grazing? Have the criteria for identifying lands available for grazing changed since the RMP was completed?	Yes, the RMP identifies lands available or not available for grazing. No, the criteria have not changed.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Livestock & Grazing monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
How well do the Fire Planning Units (FPU) match up with FPU's of adjoining BLM districts in Utah, and adjoining states?	We have had no issues with FPU's matching up with adjoining districts or states.	No Change
In cases where FPU's do not match, is there sufficient rationale to validate the FPU boundaries for the planning area?	No Issues	No Change
Does the RMP present any constraints or issues relative to complying with the Wildland Fire Policy? If so, please explain.	No Issues	No Change
Does the RMP present any constraints to approving biomass utilization or stewardship projects for energy production, commercial and/or non-commercial uses (e.g., public woodcutting, commercial, co-generation energy production, etc.)?	No Issues	No Change
Does the RMP conform to current policies on Fire Management Planning for identifying fire management units (FMU)?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide objectives for appropriate use of managed fire for resource benefit?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Fire monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address special cultural and paleontological resource issues, including traditional cultural properties and NRHP-eligible or listed districts or sites that may affect the location, timing, or method of development or use of other resources in the planning area?	Yes, RMP guidance includes protections for eligible properties impacted by grazing, which are to be mitigated; protection of Traditional Cultural Properties through avoidance or minimization of impacts; prohibition of camping in sites eligible to the NRHP; protections for burial sites, associated burial goods, and sacred items. The RMP identifies two rock art districts with high visitation for interpretation, development, and protection in addition to stating that additional culturally sensitive areas will have specific management plans developed. It names two canyons and several ACECs in which cultural resources are identified as a management priority, and several SRMA areas that will also emphasize cultural resources. With respect to Paleontological resources, the RMP addresses several resource issues such as casting, land disposals, petrified wood collection in specific high visitation areas and future closures to collection of rare and significant invertebrate and plant fossil sites. Several areas are identified for interpretation and development such as the Dinosaur Diamond National Prehistoric Byway, Mill Canyon, Copper Ridge and Poison Spider trackways.	No Change
Does the RMP refer to requirements for consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other laws and directives for with tribal governments, including general timeframes for completing consultation?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP adequately describe or summarize the extent and type of significant archaeological resources known and assign cultural resources to the use categories specified in BLM Manuals?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP fully protect significant cultural and paleontological resources through special designations?	Yes to some extent, CUL-13 and CUL-14 on page 55; CUL-24 and CUL-25 on page 57. CUL-17, CUL-19, CUL-21, CUL-22 emphasize cultural resources in specific management plans such as SRMAs or specifically identify areas for cultural resource protection. There are additional significant sites that are not called out specifically, but are managed under ARPA and NHPA and other regulations and guidance identified in the RMP. With respect to paleontological resources there are several sites identified for interpretation and site stabilization for visitors and areas designated as closed to collection of petrified wood. However changes to the RMP are being proposed to address additional interpretive sites. Also, Moab has begun the process of identifying some significant fossil resource areas that may need to be closed in order to protect scientifically important plant and invertebrate fossil resources, per decision PAL-12.	Modify PAL-8 and PAL-11.

Do route and area travel designations in the RMP address cultural and paleontological resource needs and protection?	Designation language in the ROD does mention protection of cultural resources. Additionally there are specific Cultural Resource Decisions that are specific to actions required to protect cultural resources when considering route changes and new routes. Paleontological resources are not specifically mentioned in travel route designations, however new routes would be addressed in proposals for any new surface disturbing activities.	No Change
Does the RMP allow for the definition and management of Traditional Cultural Properties?	ROD provides some management criteria for TCPs, but no definition criteria. Yes. Management decision CUL-3 to CUL-5 page 54	No Change
Does the RMP address land use applications that may affect cultural and paleontological resources, including tribal resources?	Yes the RMP addresses grazing and travel planning directly in the ROD.	No Change
Are the decisions in the RMP based on adequate cultural and paleontological resource data as specified in BLM Planning Guidance? Is a new Class I overview needed?	Most of the decisions for cultural resources in the RMP are based on a literature search and predictive model. The BLM has recently contracted for a Class I Cultural Resources Inventory for the planning area. Once completed, the Class I Inventory will be reviewed and consideration will be given to if the new information warrants consideration through a plan amendment.	No Change Continue to
Does the RMP include goals of identifying, preserving, and protecting significant cultural and paleo resources and ensuring that they are available for present and future use?	The goals and objectives sections of both the Cultural and Paleontological Decisions both state the need to protect significant resources and ensuring they are available for appropriate use for present and future generations, although its stated more clearly in the Cultural Resource Section of the RMP (the Paleontological Section doesn't specifically talk about future generations). Well known sites are targeted for interpretation and/or stabilization.	pursue additional nominations as time and resources allow.
Does the RMP include the stated goal of reducing threats and resolving potential conflicts by ensuring compliance with NHPA Section 106 and Paleontological Resource Protection Act?	Yes for NHPA. RMP does not cite Paleontological Resource Protection Act.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Cultural Resources and Paleontology monitoring requirements are current and achievable, subject to available funding and resources.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Do all special management designations have clear management objectives? If not, explain.	Yes	No Change
Does the planning area have overlapping special management designations and if so, are the management objectives conflicting with one another? This could include an ACEC or SRMA overlapping a WSA, or various OHV designations within a single management area.	Yes, WSAs, SRMAs and ACECs do overlap in some areas.	No Change
Does the District have designated wilderness? If so, has a wilderness management plan completed?	Yes, the Black Ridge Wilderness, but it is a piece of a larger wilderness area, mostly in the Grand Junction Field Office (Colorado). It is managed by the Grand Junction office.	No Change
Are there citizen-proposed wilderness areas identified in the planning area. If so, describe.	Yes, approximately 980,000 acres which includes WSAs and Natural Areas identified in the RMP.	No Change
Does the RMP state clearly that Wilderness Study Areas will be managed under the "Interim Management Policy (IMP) for Lands under Wilderness Review" (H-8550-1) or BLM Manual 6330 "Management of Wilderness Study Areas"?	Yes for IMP, no for Manual 6330.	Update references to IMP to current policy (Manual 6330).
Has the District wilderness characteristics inventory been updated since the original inventory?	Yes, Moab BLM has undertaken nine specific inventories in response to internal and external new information. Additionally, Moab BLM undertook a comprehensive review of all 5000 acres or greater roadless polygons within the FO boundaries.	Plan amendment to consider new inventory information.
Does the RMP identify lands with wilderness characteristics and apply management constraints to some lands identified as possessing wilderness characteristics?	Yes: these are called BLM Natural Areas in the RMP.	No Change
Are allocations appropriate for areas with wilderness characteristics that have been designated for protection of the wilderness values?	Yes, all BLM Natural Areas are managed with an NSO prescription.	No Change
Do planning decisions identify wilderness study areas as either designated or closed to OHV use? Do planning decisions identify OHV use within Wilderness Study Areas as limited to "designated" ways or "closed to OHV use"?	Yes, some of both.	No Change
Are wild and scenic river studies completed for the planning area which identify and evaluate river segments to determine eligibility, tentative classification, protection requirements, and suitability?	Yes	No Change
For public lands along streams identified as potentially suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, have interim management measures been established?	Yes, some prescriptive measures are identified in RMP - managed as either NSO or closed for all surface disturbing activities.	No Change
Does the RMP contain a separate section on managing National Historic Trails as specified by BLM Manual 6280?	Yes, a separate section includes management decisions for the Old Spanish Trail National Historic Trail.	No Change

Does the RMP establish National Historic Trail Management Corridors as specified by BLM Manual 6280, or address how such corridors will be established in the future?	No, the RMP does not establish corridors. Corridors will be established with the Old Spanish National Historic Trail Management strategy that is pending. Decisions TRA-1 through TRA-7 specifically identify the OST.	No Change
Are there National Historic Trails designated on the District? If so, has a comprehensive trail management plan been completed?	Yes, the Old Spanish Trail. A Comprehensive Administrative Strategy is being completed by the Utah State Office.	No Change
Are there objectives and management actions identified through either the RMP or the comprehensive management plan, for high priority trail segments or segments eligible or listed on the NHRP?	The RMP prescribes identifying trail segments and it does identify one high priority section for acquisition.	No Change
Is the plan consistent with updated National Conservation Lands policies?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP address Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs)?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP outline management objectives and restrictions that would apply to the ACECs?	Yes, it does both through specific prescriptions and decisions.	No Change
Have management plans been developed for designated ACECs that identify objectives and management actions? Does the plan identify protective management for relevance and importance values?	No plans have been developed; however protective management for R and I values are clearly specified in the RMP.	No Change
If the RMP says that activity (implementation) plans will be developed for Special Designations such as ACECs, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness or National Scenic & Historic Trails; have these plans been completed? If the RMP say that activity plans will be developed for other designated management areas such as SRMAs, Back Country Byways, OHV use areas, etc...; have these plans been completed? If so, list the name of the plan and date it was completed.	Only the Old Spanish Trail has a plan prescribed, and it is being completed by the state OST coordinator. Activity Plans are: Boating Management Plan (5/2012), Canyon Rims SRMA (12/2001), Colorado Riverway SRMA (June , 2001), Dolores River Canyons (September 2009), Sand Flats SRMA (August, 1994), South Moab SRMA (December 2011), Two Rivers SRMA (July 2010), Utah Rims SRMA (October, 2011), Cameo Cliffs SRMA (June, 2005), Mill Creek Management Plan (February, 2001).	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Non-WSA Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, ACEC, National Historic Trail, and Wild and Scenic Rivers monitoring requirements are current and achievable. Wilderness Study Area monitoring requirements are achievable, but should be updated to remove "...and 0.8 miles on the west side of the Lost Spring Canyon" and references to it.	Maintenance Action 40 updated this

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify the allowable kinds and levels of recreational use to protect or conserve other resource values in the planning area? List any limitations or restrictions on recreational activities to protect or conserve other resource values.	Camping controls—campground only or designated sites in many areas, dispersed camping vehicles stay on designated roads; limit camping, wood gathering, firewood cutting, require fire pans and portable toilets; travel control, motorized and mechanized route designation, mark designated routes and close non-designated via signage, barriers and fencing; hardening or construct sites such as parking lots and toilets; implementing fees; coordinate with other agencies for resource protection and use control; control invasive and exotic weeds; interdisciplinary SRMA mgt. plans; language as to location of campground facilities; focus areas to minimize user conflicts.	No Change
Does the RMP identify allowable kinds and level of land uses to sustain recreational values? List any limitations or restrictions on land uses to sustain recreational values.	Yes; NSO within 0.5 miles of recreation sites; NSO in non-mechanized focus areas; VRM II in heavily used recreation areas; three rivers withdrawal from mineral entry.	No Change
Have the Recreation Management issues changed since the RMP was completed? If yes, how are those issues being handled?	Yes, visitation has increased dramatically (especially motorized use). Travel management and resource protection measures are being implemented at an enhanced rate, when staffing allows; construction of facilities such as campgrounds, trailheads and trail has been made more of a priority.	No Change
Are all public lands clearly designated as SRMAs, ERMAs, or public lands not designated as recreation management areas?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP identify recreation setting characteristics? Are recreation management zones identified for SRMAs (wherever necessary)?	Yes, through specific management actions listed for each SRMA and ERMA both within the ROD and clarified in Appendix M.	No Change
Does the RMP include management objectives for the specific recreation opportunities to be produced in both SRMAS and ERMAs?	Yes	No Change
Are there significant cave resources present? If yes, are specific management goals outlined for the preservation or protection of significant cave resources?	N/A There are no cave resources within the Moab Field Office.	N/A
Monitoring	Verified that all Recreation monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify all public lands as; open, limited, or closed to OHV use?	Yes	No Change
Are the OHV designations still meeting resource objectives?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP outline travel prescriptions under each designation?	Yes, through motorized, mechanized and non-mechanized prescriptions.	No Change
Have implementation level travel plans been completed? If not, does the RMP provide a mechanism to complete an implementation plan? Explain.	Yes	No Change
Is the plan consistent with updated TTM policy/manual?	Yes	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Travel Management monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify visual resource management classes?	Yes	No Change
Do the VRM management classes consider the relationships between the visual resource inventory values and resource allocations?	Yes	No Change
Are the constraints imposed by the VRM classes appropriate for protecting sensitive resources and managing development?	No, in areas of current heavy recreation use VRM class may not be adequate any longer. There is new VRI information to be considered.	Plan amendment to consider new VRI.
Does the RMP include visual resource inventory classes and visual resource management classes?	No, VRI was considered in RMP decision, but VRI is not included in the RMP.	Plan amendment to consider new VRI.
Monitoring	Verified that all Visual Resource Management monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Do the designated Herd Management Areas (HMA) in the RMP contain adequate water and forage to maintain the Appropriate Management Level (AML) and achieve a thriving ecologic balance?	Wild horses and burros are not known to occur in the Moab Field Office area.	N/A
Do the existing populations in HMA's confine their use within the HMA?	Wild horses and burros are not known to occur in the Moab Field Office area.	N/A
Are there opportunities to expand HMA's where WH&B populations regularly stray from the HMA?	Wild horses and burros are not known to occur in the Moab Field Office area.	N/A
Are there HMA's where conditions are such (ecological, animal health, public safety, etc.) that the population should be removed and the HMA returned to Herd Area status?	Wild horses and burros are not known to occur in the Moab Field Office area.	N/A
Does the RMP identify guidelines and criteria to limit population growth within the HMA	Wild horses and burros are not known to occur in the Moab Field Office area.	N/A

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP identify priority wildlife species and habitats?	Yes, each is discussed.	No Change
Are there management plans or prescriptions in place for priority habitats?	Yes, but some changes have occurred - DWR has made changes to their big game habitat maps; deer & elk crucial winter range changes & the removal of some greater & Gunnison sage grouse habitats were implemented through plan maintenance. Changes not addressed; (1)DWR desert bighorn new habitat files have not yet been implemented due to the potential impacts from expanding lambing habitats which is currently managed as NSO. (2) Pronghorn habitat have been changed, expanded. (3)FWS has identified proposed critical habitats for the GUSG & YBCU.	Add YUCU & GUSG critical habitats and new DWR bighorn lambing & pronghorn updates.
Does the RMP contain measurable objectives for desired wildlife habitat conditions for major habitat types?	Goals for habitats have been established, and management actions that would be allowed or disallowed to maintain, protect, and enhance habitats have been identified, but objectives are not easily measureable.	No Change
Are the Western Association of the Fish and Wildlife Agency (WAFWA) guidelines for wildlife (sage grouse, mule deer, bighorn sheep, etc.) incorporated into the RMP?	No - we use guidelines from the DWR 2002 Management Plan & BLM Conservation Strategy for Sage-grouse, DWR plans for big game, for bighorn, the BLM Management Plan (1993), the Utah BLM Desert BHS Plan (1998) & 1998 Management Plan for Domestic sheep & Goats in Wild Sheep Habitats.	No Change
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect migratory birds and their associated habitat?	WL 4-WL 9 provides measures to implement EO 131876, identify BCC and PIF priority species and provide management to avoid impacts, prioritize habitat improvements, reduce the spread of weeds, and avoid surface disturbances & pesticide use during nesting season (5/1-7/31).	No Change
Does the RMP provide adequate direction to protect raptors and their associated habitat?	Yes, WL-18 through BMPs from FWS, appendix R.	No Change
Has the RMP undergone Section 7 consultation for all listed species within the planning area?	Yes for all listed in 2008. Not for YBCU & GUSG.	Work with FWS on this. May need to consult, probably will be done on a statewide level.

Are RMP decisions consistent with the supporting Biological Assessments, Biological Opinions, and Recovery Plans? If not, explain.	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP contain strategies to conserve threatened or endangered and special status species, including listed species, species proposed for listing, and BLM sensitive species?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide direction to manage priority wildlife, fish, T&E, rare plants, including transplant, augmentations, seasonal restrictions, guidelines, etc.?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP provide objectives and actions for containing the potential spread of wildlife diseases, such as adequate separation between domestic and wild species; or white nose syndrome?	WL 39 - support conversion from sheep to cattle, do not allow cattle to sheep. Currently the DWR manages for this through removal as necessary. Nothing for white nose syndrome (WNS) as we do not have known large hibernacula or maternity roosts.	No Change
Does the RMP contain effective strategies for no net loss threatened or endangered, special status or sensitive species?	Yes, for the species listed in 2008.	Need to update for additional species added since 2008.
Does the RMP include use of the State Wildlife Action Plan? Does the RMP include consideration of climate adaptation for T&E, and BLM sensitive species (i.e. keeping pathways open for movement to refugia, etc.)?	No. Climate adaptation not specifically mentioned.	No Change
Monitoring	Verified that all Special Status Species and Wildlife and Fisheries monitoring requirements are current and achievable.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP incorporate BLM's Wind Energy Development Policy? If not, how is wind energy being addressed?	Yes. LAR-10: Authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development will incorporate best management practices including the USFWS's "Guidelines for Wind Power" and provisions contained in the Final Wind Energy Programmatic EIS (June 24, 2005; BLM 2005d). LAR-11: Both wind and solar energy development (renewable energy) can be considered wherever ROWs could be authorized. ACEC-2: ACECs will be avoidance areas for all ROWs, including wind, solar energy and communication sites.	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate the allocations and stipulations developed through the National Wind, Solar, and Geothermal PEISs? If not explain:	Surface disturbing activities would be tied to the stipulations outlined in Appendix A, and conditions of approval applied to project to protect resources. These PEISs would be referred to should we receive a proposal. The Solar PEIS designated 587 acres as a variance area. The Wind PEIS did not mention Moab. Moab was not proposed for amendment in the Geothermal PEIS.	No Change
Does the RMP reference the DOE/BLM publication of February 2003 on Assessing the Potential for Renewable Energy on public land? If not, how is renewable energy being addressed?	No. Wind and Solar energy proposal can be considered wherever ROWs can be authorized.	No Change
Does the RMP incorporate the Solar Energy Development Policy (<i>IM 2007-097 updated to IM 2011-003 and extended to 9/30/15</i>)? If not, how is solar energy addressed?	No. LAR-10 and LAR-11.	No Change
Does the RMP address or incorporate the Fish and Wildlife Service Bald and Golden Eagle Guidelines with respect to renewable energy development? If not, how are these guidelines being addressed?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP reference the 2008 BLM/DOD Wind Energy Protocol? If not, explain:	No, the RMP pre-dates this protocol.	No Change
Does the RMP address transmission issues and identify transmission corridors? If corridors are identified, do they adequately match corridors established on the other side of the boundaries (i.e. does the corridor extend beyond the boundary of the RMP into the jurisdiction of the next RMP, and are they consistent across boundaries with respect to corridor widths, requirements, etc.)?	Yes. Transmission corridors are identified in the RMP.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide for orderly corridor planning to meet current National needs and technological trends?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP adequately consider ROW corridors, ROW use areas, and other ROW issues as outlined in IM 2002-196 Right of Way Management – Land Use Planning (6/26/02)?	Yes	No Change
Does the scope of designated corridors within the planning area accommodate existing, compatible, proposed and/or new uses?	Yes	No Change
Do designated corridors have appropriate width given potential and existing uses or energy demand?	Yes	No Change
Are there resource management objectives for TES for designated corridors?	Yes	No Change
Are there vegetation management objectives identified specifically within designated corridors that provide for sustainability of habitat while accommodating long-term maintenance of rights of way within the corridor?	The first Vegetation Goal/Objective (p. 131) establishes that the RMP will manage vegetation for desired future conditions. The RMP contains specific guidance for maintaining certain species' habitat in Vegetation and Wildlife decisions. The Lands and Realty section closes some areas because of resource concerns. While there are no vegetation or habitat conditions specifically tied to designated corridors, existing guidance in the RMP, tied with site-specific NEPA, can accommodate long-term maintenance of rights of way while providing for sustainability of habitat.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address the intent of WO-IM-2012-117 leasing reform? I.E: a) Standardized Stipulations; b) Master Leasing Plans; c) Lease sale parcel review process?	No. There are currently 2 Master Leasing Plan areas identified within the planning area. The Moab Master Leasing Plan was just released in draft and the Cisco Desert Master Leasing Plan will be formally initiated in late summer/early fall of 2016. We follow the leasing reform practice of conducting EAs with public outreach for oil and gas lease sales and follow the lease sale parcel review process.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP address mitigation and monitoring in such a way to meet the Regional Mitigation objectives as identified in BLM 1794 Manual [draft] on Regional Mitigation?	BLM Manual 1794 is still in draft form.	No Change
If not, does the plan require maintenance to incorporate the new 1794 Manual?		

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP recognize the 2009 BLM Air Quality Manual (MS 7300) and assess climate change as required by Secretarial Order 3289-I and Departmental Manual 523 DMI (dated 12/20/2012)?	Climate change is acknowledged and addressed qualitatively. RMP predates the 2009 BLM Air quality manual.	No Change
Does the RMP analysis address greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions for affected resource programs such as fluid mineral production or other activities with GHG generating potential?	GHGs are addressed qualitatively.	No Change
Does the RMP analysis address climate change effects and adaptation measures on natural resources? Explain:	VEG-15 addresses climate adaptation measures specific to drought.	No Change
Has the planning area been inventoried for terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential?	No	No Change
Are there areas of terrestrial or subsurface carbon sequestration potential in the planning area as evidenced by applications to explore or develop?	No	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Does the RMP provide adequate policy to preserve or enhance sage-grouse habitat and implement sage-grouse conservation planning? [Note: Greater-sage grouse in Richfield, Kanab, Vernal, and Price planning areas; Gunnison sage-grouse in Moab and Monticello planning areas.]	The Moab RMP will be amended through the Gunnison Sage Grouse Rangewide EIS. However, the language in the plan is adaptive and covers any changes in the listing of the species and the protection of sagebrush habitat.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Is the RMP geospatial data in digital format? If not, is it in hardcopy and do you know where the spatial data is located?	Yes	No Change
Does the geospatial data meet BLM National data standards where they exist?	Yes	No Change
Is the geospatial planning data managed and archived according to WO IM 2003-238?	Yes	No Change
Is the RMP selected alternative geospatial data incorporated into the corporate data for the State and District?	Yes	No Change
Does the geospatial data for the RMP have metadata? If so, is this metadata up to date and maintained? If there is no metadata, explain:	Yes and yes, to the best of our ability.	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are management actions outlined in the plan in the plan being implemented?	Yes	No Change
Does the RMP have an implementation schedule and is it current?	Yes and no. The implementation schedule could be updated.	No Change
Is the rate and degree to which plan implementation is being completed meeting the goals and objectives of the RMP?	Yes	No Change
Are management actions (decisions implemented) effective in achieving management goals and objectives?	Yes	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are there major changes in the related plans of other agencies (including tribal, state and county) since the RMP was approved which are resulting in RMP direction to be inconsistent with the direction contained in those plans?	No	No Change

Question	Response	Action
Are there new data or analyses that significantly affect the planning decisions or validity of the NEPA analysis?	No	No Change
Are there unmet needs or new opportunities that can best be met through a plan amendment or revision, or will current management be sufficient?	New VRI information and wilderness inventories would need to be considered through the plan amendment process. Additional restrictions on where petrified wood could be collected would also need to be accomplished through the plan amendment process.	Amendment
Are new inventories warranted pursuant to the BLM's duty to maintain inventories on a continuous basis (FLPMA Section 201)?	Moab maintains a lands with wilderness characteristics inventory, and the visual resource inventory was completed after the RMP.	No Change
Based on this evaluation, is there sufficient cause to warrant amendment or revision of the RMP to accommodate implementation of National and State priorities and initiatives? If so, identify the program area(s) which warrant plan modification and the initiative/priorities affected.	No	No Change
Based on new information or circumstances, is there sufficient cause to warrant completing supplemental NEPA analyses or RFDs to keep the RMP current? If so, identify the specific program areas which require focused supplemental analysis or RFDs.	No	No Change

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
------------	----------	------------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------	---------

Note: Acreages throughout the RMP need to be adjusted to reflect the acquired lands in the Federal Recreational Land Exchange

AQ-1	As appropriate, quantitative analysis of potential Air Quality impacts will be conducted for project-specific developments.	X				
AQ-2	Prescribed burns will be consistent with the State of Utah Division of Environmental Quality (UDEQ) permitting process and timed so as to minimize smoke impacts.	X				
AQ-3	Comply with Utah Air Conservation (UAC) Regulation R446-1. The best air quality control technology, as per guidance from the Utah Division of Air Quality (UDAQ), will be applied to actions on public lands as needed to meet air quality standards.	X				
AQ-4	Comply with UAC Regulation R446-1-4.5.3, which prohibits the use, maintenance, or construction of roadways without taking appropriate dust abatement measures. Compliance will be obtained through special	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	stipulations as a requirement on new projects and through the use of dust abatement control techniques in problem areas.					
AQ-5	Manage all BLM and BLM-authorized activities to maintain air quality within the thresholds established by the State of Utah Ambient Air Quality Standards and to ensure that those activities continue to keep the area as attainment, meet prevention of significant deterioration (PSD) Class II standards, and protect the Class I air shed of the National Parks (e.g., Arches and Canyonlands National Parks).	X				
AQ-6	Comply with the current Smoke Management Memorandum of Agreement (MOU) between BLM, USFS, and UDAQ. The MOU, in accordance with UAC regulation R446-1-2.4.4, requires reporting size, date of burn, fuel type, and estimated air emissions from each prescribed burn.	X				
AQ-7	BLM will continue to work	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	cooperatively with state, federal, and tribal entities in developing air quality assessment protocols to address cumulative impacts and regional air quality issues.					
AQ-8	BLM will continue to work cooperatively with the Utah Airshed Group to manage emissions from wildland and prescribed fire activities.	X				
AQ-9	National Ambient Air Quality Standards are enforced by the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Air Quality (UDEA-DAQ), with EPA oversight. Special requirements to reduce potential air quality impacts will be considered on a case-by-case basis in process land use authorizations.	X				
AQ-10	BLM will utilize BMPs and site specific mitigation measures, when appropriate, based on site specific conditions, to reduce emissions and enhance air quality. Examples of these types	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	of measures can be found in the Four Corners Air Quality Task Force Report of Mitigation Options, November 1, 2007.					
AQ-11	Project specific analyses will consider use of quantitative air quality analysis methods (i.e. modeling), when appropriate as determined by BLM, in consultation with state, federal and tribal entities.	X				
CUL -1	The BLM will comply with all pertinent statutes, regulations, formal agreements, Executive Orders, and policy as it applies to cultural resource management for all actions resulting from decisions in this land-use plan.	X				
CUL-2	Protect burial sites, associated burial goods, and sacred items in accordance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act.	X				NAGPRA objects need repatriation at various museums. Two sites remain unprotected. Additional resources are necessary to complete this work.
CUL-3	Native American requests to practice traditional activities on	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	public lands will be considered on a case-by-case basis and will be allowed where practical and appropriate. Reasonable access to specific sacred sites will be allowed under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.					
CUL-4	All treaty and trust responsibilities as they apply to public lands within the resource area will be honored.	X				
CUL-5	All land-disturbing activities within Traditional Cultural Properties will be designed to avoid or minimize impacts, where reasonable. Proposed projects or actions will be modified to avoid the area or site, avoid time of use by Native American groups, or will be eliminated altogether. Cultural sites may be closed to visitation when it is determined that this visitation is endangering site integrity.	X				Some sites need to be closed to visitation because site integrity is endangered. Additional resources are necessary to complete this work.
CUL-6	Camping will be prohibited and posted within or on archaeological and historic sites eligible for	X				Posting of additional 'No Camping' signs is needed.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	listing on the National Register of Historic Places.					
CUL-7	Class III inventory is not required prior to designations that allow continued use of an existing route, impose new limitations on an existing route, close an open area or travel route, keep a closed area closed, or keep an open area open.	X				
CUL-8	Class III cultural resources inventory will be conducted on newly designated ATV, motorcycle and mountain bike routes (48" wide or less) based on potential resource conflicts. Routes identified for survey will be prioritized based on landscape level overviews, cultural resource predictive models, and available site location, environmental, and contextual information. If eligible archaeological sites along these routes are being adversely impacted by continued route use, impacts will be mitigated. "New routes" are defined as those designated in the Travel Plan	X				Class III surveys are being conducted on all newly designated trails.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	accompanying this RMP.					
CUL-9	Where there is a reasonable expectation that a proposed route designation would shift, concentrate or expand travel into areas where historic properties are likely to be adversely affected, <i><u>Class III inventory and compliance with Section 106, focused on areas where adverse effects are likely to occur, is required prior to designation.</u></i>		X			Replace italicized and underlined phrase with: “reasonable and good faith efforts to identify historic properties will be undertaken in accordance with current regulatory requirements, NHPA agreements, and bureau policy.”
CUL-10	Proposed designations of new routes will require Class III inventory of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and compliance with Section 106 prior to designation. Class III inventory of the APE and compliance with Section 106 will also be required prior to identifying new locations proposed as staging areas or similar areas of concentrated OHV use.	X				
CUL-11	Eligible cultural sites will be protected and impacts mitigated		X			Update language to match bureau policy:

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	when it is determined that they are being impacted from grazing activities.					<i>Adverse effects to eligible cultural sites will be avoided, minimized and /or mitigated.</i>
CUL-12	New field inventories will be prioritized in areas of special cultural designation (e.g., ACECs, National Historic Trails, National Historic Landmarks) that have not been fully inventoried.	X				Additional resources are necessary to complete this work.
CUL-13	Sego Rock Art Site and Wall Street/Colorado River Rock Art District, which have educational and recreational values, will be developed for public visitation and interpretation as long as such work does not contribute to the deterioration or destruction of the resources being interpreted. Work will be conducted in partnership with universities, museums, Tribes, and interested site stewards for the creation of interpretive materials on the archaeology of the Moab Planning Area.		X			Sego Rock Art Site and Wall Street/Colorado River Rock Art District have new signs.
CUL-14	Specific management plans will be developed for up to seven	X				Additional resources are necessary to complete this

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	culturally sensitive areas unless integrated into other activity plans. These plans will also include, but will not be limited to, developing a site monitoring system; identifying sites in need of stabilization, restoration, and protective measures (e.g., fences, surveillance equipment); developing research designs for selected sites/areas; and developing specific mitigation measures.					work.
CUL-15	Cooperate with counties to ensure county road and trail construction and maintenance activities avoid or minimize impacts to cultural resources.	X				Partnership and collaboration with Grand County Trail Mix has been effective at ensuring new mountain bike and hiking trails avoid impacts to cultural resources.
CUL-16	Cultural plants, once identified by interested tribes, will be managed to insure that ground-disturbing activities on the land do not contribute to the decline of cultural sensitive plant communities. Collection of plant resources will be considered on a	X				Plants have been identified and collection is being coordinated with partners and tribe.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	case-by-case basis and will be allowed where practical and appropriate.					
CUL-17	Cultural resource management priority for the Ten Mile Wash and Mill Creek Canyon will be scientific research of prehistoric sites and cultural landscapes. Manage the Mill Creek planning area in accordance with the Mill Creek Management Plan (2001b).		X			Add: “ <i>education and/or</i> ” before scientific. Additional resources are necessary to complete this work.
CUL-18	Continue to allocate cultural sites, including ethnographic properties, to one of six management categories: a) scientific use; b) conservation for future use; c) traditional use; d) public use; e) experimental use; and f) discharged from management.	X				
CUL-19	Alternative management strategies for cultural resources are disclosed in the Special Designations sections. This section identifies areas with substantial cultural resources and alternative management prescriptions to protect these resources. These	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	areas include the Behind the Rocks, Ten Mile Wash, and Mill Creek Canyon ACECs, and the Wall Street portion of Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon proposed ACEC.					
CUL-20	Cultural use allocations will be made at the time of site documentation; allocations can be changed as new information or management direction becomes available, subject to consistency with the approved plan.	X				Additional resources are necessary to complete this work.
CUL-21	Cultural management plans will be a component of the implementation plans for the Labyrinth Canyons, Colorado Riverway and South Moab SRMAs. Heritage tourism may be considered in these cultural management plans.	X				
CUL-22	Priority for new field inventory will be a 0.50-mile vulnerability zone surrounding cities and towns.	X				
CUL-23	Prioritize for Class II and Class III surveys a total of 30,000 acres	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	within the following areas: Bookcliffs, Dolores Triangle, North Fork of Mill Creek, South Fork of Mill Creek, Seven Mile, and Ten Mile Wash and its tributaries.					
CUL-24	To prevent further degradation from occurring, target the following areas for restoration of damaged cultural resources: South and North Forks of Mill Creek, Bartlett/Hidden Canyon, Hell Roaring uplands, Ten Mile Wash and Wall Street Rock Art District.	X				Additional resources are necessary to complete this work.
CUL-25	The following sites will be hardened and interpreted for public use: one site in Lower Kane Springs Canyon, and 3 sites in the Wall Street Rock Art District.		X			<p>Update wording as follows:</p> <p><i>Lower Kane Springs Canyon and the Wall Street Rock Art District will be hardened and/or interpreted for public use.</i></p> <p>Note: One interpretative sign installed along Wall Street. Additional resources are necessary to complete this</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						work.
FIRE-1	The Moab Fire District Fire Management Plan (FMP) will be updated and amended to meet the direction and objectives of the RMP.		X			Update title of document to “ <i>Canyon Country Fire Zone Fire Management Plan</i> ”
FIRE-2	Firefighter and public safety are the primary goals in all fire management decisions and actions.	X				
FIRE-3	Wildland fire will be utilized to protect, maintain and enhance resources and, when possible, will be allowed to function in its natural ecological role.	X				
FIRE-4	Hazardous fuels reduction treatments will be used to restore ecosystems; protect human, natural and cultural resources; and reduce the threat of wildfire to communities.	X				
FIRE-5	Fires will be suppressed at minimum cost, taking into account firefighter and public safety as well as benefits and values to be protected that are consistent with resource objectives.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
FIRE-6	The BLM will implement a consistent, safe and cost-effective fire management program through appropriate planning, staffing, training, and equipment.	X				
FIRE-7	Fire management objectives will be established for every area with burnable vegetation, based on sound science and consideration of other resource objectives.	X				
FIRE-8	Emergency stabilization, rehabilitation, and restoration efforts will be implemented to protect and sustain resources, public health and safety, and community infrastructure.	X				
FIRE-9	The BLM will work together with partners and other affected groups and individuals to reduce risks to communities and to restore ecosystems.	X				
FIRE-10	The Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions identified in consultation with the USFWS for the LUP Amendment will be implemented in fire-related	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	actions.					
FIRE-11	<p>Criteria for Establishing Fire Management Priorities: Protection of human life is the primary fire management priority. Establishing a priority among protecting human communities and community infrastructure, other property and improvements, and natural and cultural resources is based on human health and safety, the values to be protected, and the costs of protection. When firefighters and other personnel have been committed to an incident, these human resources become the highest values to be protected. Priorities for all aspects of fire management decisions and actions are based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI; including At-risk Communities and At-risk Watersheds). Maintaining existing healthy 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>ecosystems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High priority sub-basins (HUC-4) or watersheds (HUC-5). • Threatened, endangered, or special species. • Cultural resources and/or cultural landscapes. 					
FIRE-12	<p>Suppression: An "Appropriate Management Response" (AMR) procedure is required for every wildland fire that is not a prescribed fire. In all fire management decisions, strategies and actions, firefighter and public safety are the highest priority followed by consideration of benefits and values to be protected as well as suppression costs. The AMR can range from full suppression to managing fire for resource benefit (wildland fire use). Resource goals and objectives outlined in the RMP guide the development and implementation of AMR fire management activities in regard</p>		X			Change "wildland fire use" to "use of wildland fire" as per NWCG definitions.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	to the accomplishment of those objectives. The FMP establishes fire suppression objectives with minimum and maximum suppression targets for each Fire Management Unit (FMU) within the MPA. While firefighter and public safety are the first priority, considerations for suppression activities also include fire intensity, acreage, and spread potential, threats to life and property, potential to impact high-value resources such as critical habitat for threatened, endangered and sensitive species, crucial wildlife habitat, cultural resources and/or riparian areas, historic fire regimes, and other special considerations such as wilderness and/or adjacent agency lands.					
FIRE-13	Wildland Fire Use for Resource Benefit: Wildland fire is authorized as a tool, when appropriate, to allow naturally ignited wildland fire to accomplish		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” as per NWCG definitions.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>specific resource management objectives. Due to existing resource conditions and proximity to values at risk, fire cannot be allowed to resume its natural role on all BLM lands in the MPA. Consideration of ongoing management actions and other natural changes will direct periodical reassessment of DWFC and determination of potential areas for wildland fire use. Operational management of wildland fire use is described in the Wildland Fire Implementation Plan (WFIP).</p> <p>The FMP identifies areas (FMUs) that may have the potential for wildland fire use. Wildland fire use may be authorized for all areas, except when the following resources and values may be negatively impacted and there are no reasonable Resource Protection Measures to protect such resources and values:</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas. • Areas that are known to be highly susceptible to post-fire cheatgrass or invasive weed invasion. • Important terrestrial and aquatic habitats. • Non-fire-adapted vegetation communities. • Sensitive cultural resources. • Areas of soil with high or very high erosion hazard. • Class I air attainment areas and PM-10 non-attainment areas. • Administrative sites. • Developed recreation sites. • Communication sites. • Oil, gas and mining facilities. • Above-ground utility corridors. • High-use travel corridors, such as interstates, railroads, and/or highways. 					
FIRE-14	Fuels Treatment: Fuels management activities outlined in the FMP will be consistent with		X			Change “wildland fire use” to “use of wildland fire” as per NWCG definitions.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the resource goals and objectives contained in the RMP. To reduce hazards and to restore ecosystems, authorized fuels management actions include wildland fire use, prescribed fire, and mechanical, manual, chemical, biological, and seeding treatments. The FMP describes fuels management goals and objectives and the full range of fuels management strategies and actions authorized for fuels reduction. Fuels treatments are focused on the DWFC of restoring historic fire regimes to ecosystems when feasible, so that future wildland fire use actions can be more easily implemented. Fuels management actions may include but are not limited to the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical treatments such as mowing, chopping, or chipping/grinding (brush cutter), chaining, tilling, or cutting. • Manual treatments such as 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>hand-cutting (chainsaw or handsaw) and hand-piling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prescribed fire including broadcast, underburn, and hand-pile burning. • Chemical spraying or biological treatments such as insects or goats/sheep. • Seeding including aerial or ground application (manual or mechanical). <p>Targeted areas may be treated in phases over a period of several years and may involve multiple and varied treatments.</p> <p>Estimated fuels reduction treatments of 5,000 to 10,000 acres/year are targeted dependent on budgetary and time constraints. These treatments are in addition to those to be accomplished under the Utah Watershed Restoration Initiative and the National Healthy Lands Initiative.</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Implementation of fuels management actions will be prioritized using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas. • Areas with fuel loading that could potentially result in the loss of ecosystem components following wildland fire. • Resource management goals and objectives. 					
FIRE-15	<p>Prevention and Mitigation: Prevention and mitigation goals target a reduction in unauthorized wildland fire ignitions. Goals include coordination with partners and affected groups and individuals, and a wide range of prevention and mitigation activities such as personal contacts, mass media, signing, and defensible space education. Implementation of fire prevention activities will be prioritized using the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WUI areas. 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major travel corridors. Recreation sites. Public lands as a whole. 					
FIRE-16	<p>Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation (ESR): A Normal Year Fire Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan (NFRP) is in place to meet emergency stabilization and rehabilitation (ESR) needs and to comply with up-to-date ESR policy and guidance. The NFRP is a programmatic implementation plan authorizing treatment options specific to vegetative communities and dependent upon post-wildland fire conditions and other site-specific considerations. Treatment actions are designed according to the type and severity of wildfire impacts and priorities include, but are not limited to, areas where the following criteria apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is necessary to protect human life and safety as well as property. Unique or critical cultural 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>and/or historical resources are at risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is determined soils are highly susceptible to accelerated erosion. • Perennial grasses and forbs (fire-tolerant plants) are not expected to provide soil and watershed protection within two years. • There is a need to establish a vegetative fuel break of less flammable species (greenstrips). • Unacceptable vegetation, such as noxious weeds, may readily invade and become established. • Shrubs and forbs are a crucial habitat component for wintering mule deer, pronghorn, sage- grouse, or other special status species. • Stabilization and rehabilitation are necessary to meet RMP resource objectives, including 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>rangeland seedings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is necessary to protect water quality. It is necessary to quickly restore threatened, endangered, or special species habitat populations to prevent adverse impacts. 					
HAZ-1	Comply with all applicable Abandoned Mine Lands (AML) policies.	X				
HAZ-2	In conformance with BLM's long-term strategies and national policies regarding Abandoned Mine Lands (AML), this RMP recognizes the need to work with our partners toward identifying and addressing physical safety and environmental hazards at all AML sites on public lands. In order to achieve this goal, a State strategy has been written. National program criteria for determining site priorities were used to develop the work plan. This State strategy is entitled "Utah's Abandoned Mine Land	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Multi Year Work Plan."					
HAZ-3	<p>The criteria that will be used to establish physical safety hazard program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AML physical safety program's highest priority will be the cleaning up of those AML sites where (a) a death or injury has occurred, (b) the site is situated on or in immediate proximity to developed recreation sites and areas with high visitor use, and (c) upon formal risk assessment, a high or extremely high risk level is indicated. AML will be factored into future recreation management area designations, land-use planning assessments, and all applicable use authorizations. The site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines Module of Protection and 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Response Information System.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AML hazards should be, to the extent practicable, mitigated or remediated on the ground during site development. 					
HAZ-4	<p>The criteria used to establish water quality-based AML program priorities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State has identified the watershed as a priority based on (a) one or more water laws or regulations; (b) threat to public health or safety; and (c) threat to the environment. The project reflects a collaborative effort with other land managing agencies. The site is presently listed or is eligible for listing in the Abandoned Mines Site Cleanup Module of Protection and Response Information System. The project will be funded by contributions from 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	collaborating agencies.					
HAZ-5	Identify and clean up unauthorized dumping sites and hazardous materials spills in the MPA as required to comply with applicable State, local, and Federal regulations.	X				
HAZ-6	The State Multi Year Work Plan will be maintained and updated as needed to reflect current policy for identifying program physical safety and water quality AML sites priorities for reclamation and remediation.	X				
LAR-1	Under <u>IMP</u> and Congressional action, Wilderness Study Areas and Wilderness Areas will be exclusion areas for any ROWs (Section 501(a) FLPMA).		X			Update IMP (italicized and underlined) to new wilderness manuals: MS-6330, MS-6340.
LAR-2	Continue the withdrawal of lands along the Colorado, Dolores and Green Rivers (totaling 65,037 acres within the MPA) from mineral entry (Three Rivers Withdrawal, October 6, 2004). In addition, continue the Westwater (8,096 acres) and	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Black Ridge Wilderness (5,200 acres) withdrawals (see Map 5).					
LAR-3	Give land exchanges with the State of Utah priority consideration to resolve inholding issues.	X				
LAR-4	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs) will be avoidance areas for any new ROWs (including communication sites and wind and solar sites).	X				
LAR-5	Decisions on Land Tenure Adjustments and withdrawals will be made in accordance with the criteria contained in Appendix G.	X				
LAR-6	Determinations on authorizing commercial filming in the MPA will be made in accordance with the criteria outlined in Appendix H for minimum impact filming and standard NEPA procedures for projects not meeting minimum impact criteria.	X				
LAR-7	Right-of-way (ROW) avoidance and exclusion areas will be consistent with the stipulations identified in Appendix A for oil and gas leasing and other	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	surface-disturbing activities. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource values.					
LAR-8	As per the State of Utah v. Andrus, Oct. 1, 1979 (Cotter Decision), the BLM will grant the State of Utah reasonable access to State lands for economic purposes, on a case-by-case basis.	X				
LAR-9	To reduce surface use conflicts along the U.S. Highway 191 utility corridor within Moab Canyon, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A), except those associated with utility ROWs.	X				
LAR-10	Authorization of any ROW for wind or solar energy development will incorporate best management practices including the USFWS's "Guidelines for Wind Power" and provisions contained in the Final Wind Energy Programmatic EIS (June 24, 2005; BLM 2005d).		X			Consider modifying to include Solar Energy EIS (which amended the Moab RMP).

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
LAR-11	Both wind and solar energy development (renewable energy) can be considered wherever ROWs could be authorized.		X			Consider modifying to include Solar Energy EIS (which amended the Moab RMP).
LAR-12	To be consistent with the existing withdrawals from mineral entry, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities within the area of the Three Rivers and Westwater Mineral Withdrawals. This action will further protect the riparian, wildlife, scenic, and recreation values addressed in these withdrawals. Applying a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing to lands within the Three Rivers Withdrawal, in combination with other areas where a no surface occupancy stipulation is applied, results in tracts of land that are physically inaccessible to oil and gas operations. For this reason, portions of the lands within the Three Rivers Withdrawal (e.g.,		X			Decision may be amended by the Moab MLP. Revisit when the Record of the Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	along the Colorado River near the Richardson Amphitheater and along the Dolores River near Beaver Creek) will be closed to oil and gas leasing. These areas will be managed as no surface occupancy for other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A).					
LAR-13	Lands and/or interest in lands (such as minerals and conservation easements) acquired through future LTA will take on the management of the surrounding area. Land acquisitions will be pursued if they meet the criteria in Appendix G.	X				
LAR-14	Designate an I-70 utility corridor that includes all major existing ROWs as identified in the RMP with a 1/2-mile width on each side of the widest ROW corridor. Designate the existing Moab Canyon utility corridor (Map 6).	X				
LAR-15	Combine the two corridors south of Spanish Valley into a single	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	corridor (Map 6). The corridor will include the approximately 2 to 3 miles separating the two segments.					
LAR-16	About 370,250 acres will be exclusion areas for ROWs. About 217,480 acres will be avoidance areas for ROWs.	X				
LAR-17	Parcels identified for disposal total 14,961 acres and are shown on Map 7 and in Appendix I.	X				
GRA-1	Grazing will be managed according to the <i>Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management</i> to meet the Standards for Rangeland Health, including adjustment in seasons of use.	X				
GRA-2	On all allotments, allow allotment boundaries adjustments, joining and splitting, and modification of grazing season subject to appropriate NEPA review and analysis (see Map 8 for a map of grazing allotments).	X				
GRA-3	Continue to authorize grazing at the current preference levels (as per ten-year grazing permits) and adjust, if necessary to meet	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Standards for Rangeland Health.					
GRA-4	<p>As amended in previous planning documents (the 1985 Grand RMP and a Plan Amendment analyzed in EA#068-94-047), grazing use will continue to not be authorized on the following allotments/areas (or portions of allotments/areas):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Between The Creeks with 3,960 acres and 221 AUMs, to protect municipal watersheds, improve mule deer winter range, improve riparian habitat, and reduce recreation conflict. North Sand Flats with 18,246 acres and 798 AUMs, to reduce recreation conflict, improve mule deer winter range, and improve riparian habitat. South Sand Flats with 10,209 acres and 592 AUMs, to reduce recreation conflict, improve mule deer winter range, and improve 		X			<p>Add “Cattleguard” after Hittle Bottom (last bullet; underlined and italicized) to avoid confusion.</p> <p>The newly created Round Mountain Allotment is located in Castle Valley on what was previously State land, which had a grazing permit issued by the State. The land exchange agreement recognizes all valid existing rights of the state lands exchanged and allows grazing to continue. This allotment is not part of the 6,074 acres described in this section.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>riparian habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of Arth's Pasture Allotment (Poison Spider area) with approximately 7,634 acres and 425 AUMs, to improve desert bighorn sheep habitat and reduce recreation conflict. • Castle Valley with 6,074 acres and 190 AUMs, to protect the Castle Valley sole source aquifer, to improve mule deer winter range, and to reduce recreation conflict. • Along Highway 128 from U.S. 191 to the Castle Valley Road, along U.S. 191 from Highway 313 to Moab, and along Highway 279 with 1,139 acres, to reduce recreation traffic conflict (no reduction in AUMs). • A portion of the Kane Spring Allotment (that portion in Kane Spring Canyon between the open valley and the river; 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>558 acres and no reduction in AUMs), to reduce recreation traffic conflict and to enhance riparian species' habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An area along the Colorado River between <u>Hittle Bottom</u> and north of Dewey Bridge (400 acres and no reduction in AUMs), to reduce recreation traffic conflict and to enhance riparian species' habitat. <p>See also decisions at GRA-16.</p>					
GRA-5	Develop AMPs on seven allotments (Agate, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, , Highlands, Monument Wash, Little Hole, and San Arroyo) and on any additional allotments if resource issues are identified to benefit vegetation, wildlife, livestock grazing and soils.		X			<p>Remove Harley Dome. Add <i>Little Hole</i>.</p> <p>Harley Dome is no longer an allotment. It is part of San Arroyo and Little Hole Allotments.</p>
GRA-6	Identify appropriate utilization levels based on allotment or site-specific management practices, such as season-of-use, grazing	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	intensity and duration, and utilization patterns, as well as vegetative conditions, the presence or absence of range improvements, and resource issues or concerns. Use utilization levels as an indicator to evaluate if current grazing use is appropriate to meet resource objectives for the area. Generally moderate utilization levels (40–60%) will be used to indicate if general management objectives can be met. Utilization levels above those identified as appropriate will be used to adjust livestock use on a yearly basis through pasture and possible early removal from allotments as needed. Utilization levels may be especially important during periods of drought. Long-term adjustments to livestock use (term permits adjustments) require the evaluation of monitoring data including climate, actual grazing use,					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	current or historic impacts, utilization mapping, and long-term trend data, as well as utilization levels.					
GRA-7	Follow the recommendations of the National Sage-grouse Habitat Conservation Strategy (BLM 2004c) and the Strategic Management Plan for Sage-grouse (UDWR 2002) where applicable.	X				
GRA-8	Conversion of allotments from cattle to domestic sheep will not be considered in recognized bighorn sheep habitat (see Maps 9 and 10).	X				
GRA-9	Collect monitoring data, including trend, utilization, actual use, and climate data to determine if existing livestock management practices are meeting land-use planning and resource objectives.	X				
GRA-10	Change class of livestock from sheep to cattle on the Hatch Point Allotment (96,951 acres) to benefit wildlife.	X				
GRA-11	Rangelands that have been burned, reseeded, or otherwise treated to		X			Remove phrase: <i>“or otherwise mechanically</i>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	alter vegetative composition will have livestock grazing use temporarily suspended as follows: (1) burned rangelands, whether by wildfire or prescribed burning, will be ungrazed for a minimum of one complete growing season following the burn; (2) rangelands that have been reseeded will be ungrazed for a minimum of two complete growing seasons following treatment.					<i>treated</i> ". There is no reason to rest an area from grazing unless it has been reseeded.
GRA-12	Relinquishment of Preference: Voluntary relinquishments of grazing permits and preference, in whole or in part, submitted by a permittee in writing to the BLM, will be handled on a case- by-case basis. BLM will not recognize as valid, relinquishments which are conditional on specific BLM actions and BLM will not be bound by them. Relinquished permits and the associated preference will remain available for application by qualified	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>applicants after BLM considers if such action will meet rangeland health standards and is compatible with achieving land-use plan goals and objectives. Prior to re-issuance of the relinquished permit, the terms and conditions may be modified to meet RMP goals and objectives and/or site-specific resource objectives. However, upon relinquishment, BLM may determine through a site-specific evaluation and associated NEPA analysis that the public lands involved are better used for other purposes. Grazing may then be discontinued on the allotment through an amendment to the existing RMP or a new RMP effort. Any decision issued concerning discontinuance of livestock grazing is not permanent and may be reconsidered and changed through future LUP Amendments and updates.</p>					
GRA-13	AUMs allotted to livestock:		X			The numbers have changed.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	106,479.					
GRA-14	Acres available for grazing: 1,690,481 acres.		X			The numbers have changed.
GRA-15	Acres not available for grazing: 132,047 acres (see Map 11).		X			The numbers have changed.
GRA-16	Allotments Not Available for Grazing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bogart with 14,744 acres and 209 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils). Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils). Diamond with 18,620 acres and 588 AUMs (to benefit wildlife to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils). Pear Park, with 14,201 acres 		X			Modify last sentence of decision as follows: <i>“This will reduce acreage in the allotments and will reduce the AUMs.”</i>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>and 200 AUMs (to benefit wildlife especially mule deer and/or elk habitat, riparian habitat, watershed health and erosive soils).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ida Gulch, with 3,612 acres 112 AUMs (to recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat). • Mill Creek with 3,921 acres and 137 AUMs (to reduce recreation and cultural conflict and to protect municipal watershed). • Portions of Professor Valley and River along Highway 128**, with 1,467 acres and 0 AUMs (to reduce recreation conflict and enhance riparian habitat). <p>**A fence will be constructed along the southeast side of Highway 128 (set back to protect the scenic resources of the National Scenic Highway). This will result in all BLM lands</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	between the Colorado River and Highway 128 being unavailable for grazing. This will reduce acreage in the allotments, but it will not reduce the AUMs, because the quality of the forage is low due to heavy use by motorists and other recreationists.					
GRA-17	Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that will be Available for Grazing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After allotment specific evaluation to assure resource objectives are met, Spring Creek Allotment will be available for livestock grazing. 	X				
GRA-18	Allotments Currently Not Available for Grazing that are to be Reconsidered for Allocation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beaver Creek with 1,351 acres and 0 AUMs. 	X				
GRA-19	Grazing in Saline Soils: Use grazing systems and develop AMPs to minimize impacts to saline soils and reduce salinity in the Colorado River drainage in		X			Remove Harley Dome. Add <i>Little Hole</i> . Harley Dome is no longer an allotment. It is part of San

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the following allotments: Agate, Athena, Big Flat-Ten Mile, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Coal Canyon, Crescent Canyon, Floy Creek, Harley Dome, Highlands, Horse Canyon, Little Grand, Lone Cone, Monument, and San Arroyo.					Arroyo and Little Hole Allotments.
GRA-20	Grazing in Riparian Areas: Evaluate non-functioning and functioning-at-risk riparian areas using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to determine if restriction from grazing will improve riparian functioning condition. The following riparian areas will be given priority for evaluation: Ten Mile from Dripping Spring to the Green River, Mill Creek, Day Canyon, Seven Mile Canyon, and East Coyote (a total of 1,169 acres).	X				
GRA-21	Vegetation Treatments: Maintain the existing vegetation treatments (46,307 acres) to increase available forage within		X			Add <i>Floy Creek</i> to list of allotments and update acreage total accordingly.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the following allotments. These areas have been treated over the past 50 years and consist primarily of pinyon-juniper woodlands. These areas will be treated by prescribed fire, chemical or mechanical or other means in accordance with BLM sagebrush conservation guidance and other applicable resource goals. The improved forage will benefit multiple use objectives including livestock and wildlife use. Allotments: Adobe Mesa, Big Triangle, Black Ridge, Buckhorn, Cisco, East Coyote, Fisher Valley, Granite Creek, Hatch Point, Lisbon, Lower Lisbon, Mountain Island, Rattlesnake South, Scharf Mesa, Spring Creek, Steamboat Mesa, Taylor, Windwhistle. (a total of 46,307 acres).					
GRA-22	Conduct new vegetation treatments (6,900 acres) for increased forage in the following allotments with prescribed fire,	X				Note: Veg treatments are/have been conducted in additional allotments.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	chemical, mechanical or other means: Floy Canyon, Hatch Point, Lisbon, and Showerbath. Other vegetation treatments will be considered to benefit other resource values such as wildlife or watershed.					
GRA-23	Implement Range Projects to Help Maintain Rangeland Health Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement range projects that will equally benefit livestock grazing and other resource values. 	X				
GRA-24	Grazing will be allowed on a limited basis in Ten Mile Wash downstream from Dripping Springs, with changes subject to future monitoring.	X				
MIN-1	Continue the withdrawal of lands along the Colorado, Dolores, and Green Rivers, totaling 65,037 acres within the MPA, from mineral entry (Three Rivers Withdrawal, October 6, 2004). In addition, continue the Westwater (8,096 acres)	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	withdrawal. Black Ridge Wilderness (5,200 acres) will remain closed, by law, to entry under the mining law.					
MIN-2	Wilderness Study Areas and designated Wilderness (358,806 acres) will remain closed, by law, to mineral leasing and development.	X				
MIN-3	Where public lands are sold or exchanged under 43 U.S.C. 682(B) (Small Tracts Act), 43 U.S.C. 869 (Recreation and Public Purposes Act), 43 U.S.C. 1718 (Sales) or 43 U.S.C. 1716 (Exchanges), the minerals reserved to the United States will continue to be removed from the operation of the mining laws unless a subsequent land-use planning decision expressly recommends restoring the land to mineral entry.	X				
MIN-4	Leasable Minerals: Split-estate lands (private surface/Federal minerals) and lands administered by other Federal agencies are not		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>managed by the BLM. The lands include about 29,678 acres of split-estate lands and the lands administered by the Manti-LaSal National Forest (141,241 acres). The surface owner or surface management agency (SMA) manages the surface. BLM administers the operational aspects of mineral leases. On lands administered by other Federal agencies, lease stipulations will include those required by the SMA. On 20,061 acres of split- estate lands, the BLM will apply the same lease stipulations as those applied to surrounding lands with Federal surface. BLM will close or impose a no surface occupancy stipulation on 9,617 acres of split-estate lands (see Appendix A). Mitigation measures to protect other resource values will be developed during the appropriate site-specific environmental analysis and will be attached as</p>					Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	conditions of approval to permits in consultation with the surface owner or SMA.					
MIN-5	Coal: The coal resources within the MPA include the Sego and the La Sal coal fields. Approximately 80% of the Sego coal field is within Wilderness Study Areas and is not available for development. For the remaining coal resources, no interest has been expressed for coal leasing and the potential for development of coal resources is low (see Mineral Potential Report). At such time as interest is expressed in coal leasing, the RMP will be amended as appropriate and mining unsuitability criteria (43 CFR 3461) will be applied by the MFO before any coal leases are issued. If coal leases are issued, they will be subject to special conditions developed in the RMP and the unsuitability assessment. This may restrict all or certain types of mining	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	techniques. Before any coal could be removed, MFO will have to approve the mining permit application package, incorporating stipulations developed in the RMP.					
MIN-6	Locatable Minerals: Existing operations will continue to be subject to the stipulations developed for the notice or the plan of operations. The BLM will evaluate all operations authorized by the mining laws in the context of its requirement to prevent unnecessary and undue degradation of Federal lands and resources. Consistent with the rights afforded claimants under the mining laws, operations conducted after this RMP will be required to conform to the surface disturbing stipulations developed in this RMP.	X				
MIN-7	Locatable Minerals: Operations on BLM-administered lands open to mineral entry must be conducted in compliance with	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	BLM's surface management regulations (43 CFR 3715, 3802, 3809, and 3814). BLM surface management regulations do not apply to operations on other Federal lands but do apply to split-estate lands.					
MIN-8	Leasable Minerals: To be consistent with the existing withdrawals from mineral entry, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) within the area of the Three Rivers and Westwater Mineral Withdrawals. This action will further protect the riparian, wildlife, scenic, and recreation values addressed in these withdrawals.	X				
MIN-9	Locatable Minerals: To the extent possible, the stipulations developed for oil and gas leasing are applicable to all mineral activities (leasable, locatable, and salable). These stipulations are found in Appendix A. Leasable		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	minerals include oil and gas, coal, and potash. Locatable minerals include gold, copper, and uranium. Salable minerals include sand and gravel, clay, and building stone.					
MIN-10	Locatable Minerals: In areas where mineral activities would be incompatible with existing surface use, apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A). These areas are as follows: Moab and Spanish Valley, Castle Valley (including Mayberry Orchard), Thompson Springs, Moab Landfill, Moab Airport, and Dead Horse Point State Park.		X			Add to list of areas: <i>Moab Uranium Mill Tailings Remedial Action (UMTRA) project.</i>
MIN-11	The Federal minerals within the incorporated city of Moab and town of Castle Valley are closed to oil and gas leasing by Federal regulation at 43 CFR 3100.0-3 (a)(2)(iii).		X			Add to beginning: <i>“Leasable Minerals:”</i>
MIN-12	Leasable Minerals: The plan will	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recognize and be consistent with the National Energy Policy Act and related BLM policy by adopting the following objectives: recognizing the need for diversity in obtaining energy supplies; encouraging conservation of sensitive resource values; improving energy distribution opportunities.					
MIN-13	Leasable Minerals: In accordance with an UDEQ-DAQ letter dated June 6, 2008 (See Appendix J) requesting implementation of interim nitrogen oxide control measures for compressor engines; BLM will require the following as a Lease Stipulation and a Condition of Approval for Applications for Permit to Drill: (1) All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 300 design-rated horsepower must not emit more than 2 gms of NOx per horsepower-hour. This	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	requirement does not apply to oil and gas field engines of less than or equal to 40 design-rated horsepower; (2) All new and replacement internal combustion oil and gas field engines of greater than 300 design rated horsepower must not emit more than 1.0 gms of NOx per horsepower-hour.					
MIN-14	Leasable Minerals: Lease stipulations have been developed to mitigate the impacts of oil and gas activity (see Appendix A and Map 12). The stipulations adhere to the Uniform Format prepared by the Rocky Mountain Regional Coordinating Committee in March 1989. Stipulations reflect the minimum requirements necessary to accomplish the desired resource protection and contain provisions/criteria to allow for exception, waiver and modification if warranted. Stipulations would be determined unnecessary if duplicative of		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Section 6 of the Standard Lease Terms. The BLM has identified Land-use Plan leasing allocations for all lands within the Moab Field Office. In addition, the Approved RMP describes specific lease stipulations and program-related Best Management Practices (both found in Appendix A: Stipulations and Environmental Best Practices Application to Oil and Gas Leasing and Other Surface Disturbing Activities) that apply to a variety of different resources.					
MIN-15	Leasable Minerals: Oil and gas leases issued prior to the RMP will continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued. Those issued subsequent to the plan will be subject to the stipulations developed in the plan. Environmental best management practices will be incorporated into subsequent permits and authorizations to mitigate impacts	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and conflicts with other uses and resource values (see Appendix A).					
MIN-16	<p>Leasable Minerals (Potash and Salt: Non-energy Leasable):</p> <p>Within the MPA, three areas fall within known potash leasing areas (KPLAs). KPLA designations, based on known geologic data, will remain in place until potash resources are depleted. In KPLAs, potash leases are acquired through competitive bidding. In areas where potash values are not known, MFO could issue prospecting permits, which could lead to issuance of a preference right lease. There are currently 8 leases and numerous pending prospecting permit applications within the MPA (Map 13). Additional KPLAs could be designated, based on geologic data, if interest warranted. Potash leasing and prospecting permits issued prior to the RMP will continue to be managed under the stipulations in effect when issued.</p>		X			<p>This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP. RFD for potash has been completed and a new KPLA, the Ten Mile KPLA, was added in 2012.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Those leases issued subsequent to the RMP will be consistent with the oil and gas leasing stipulations developed in the RMP (see Appendix A).					
MIN-17	Locatable Minerals: A no surface occupancy stipulation cannot be applied to locatable minerals without a withdrawal. All public lands overlying Federal minerals are open to mining claim location unless specifically withdrawn from mineral entry by Secretarial order or by a public land law. Therefore, other than the existing withdrawals (Three Rivers, Westwater, and Black Ridge Wilderness), all public lands with the MPA remain open under the mining laws. Future withdrawals may be recommended in areas identified as closed or with a no surface occupancy stipulation if it becomes necessary to prevent unacceptable resource impacts.	X				
MIN-18	Salable Minerals: There are	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	currently 12 community pits totaling about 2,693 acres designated in the MPA (Map 14). Existing mineral material sale contracts, free use permits, and material sites, including community pits, will continue to be subject to the permit stipulation conditions. Sales, permits, community pits or common use areas issued or designated after the RMP will be subject to permit stipulations developed in the RMP. These stipulations will be the same as those stipulations for oil and gas leasing except that areas with a no surface occupancy stipulation and closed will be closed to the disposal of salable minerals.					
MIN-19	Leasable Minerals: Oil and Gas Leasing stipulations (see Map 12): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 427,273 acres will be open to oil and gas leasing, subject to standard terms and conditions. 		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 806,994 acres will be open to oil and gas leasing subject to CSU and TL stipulations. Approximately 217,480 acres will be open to oil and gas leasing subject to an NSO stipulation. Approximately 370,250 acres will be closed to oil and gas leasing, of which 25,306 acres are outside Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas. About 25,306 acres are closed to oil and gas leasing because it is not reasonable to apply an NSO stipulation. This includes areas where the oil and gas resources are physically inaccessible by current directional drilling technology from outside the boundaries of the NSO areas. (These lands closed to oil and gas leasing will be managed to preclude all other surface-disturbing activities.) Should 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>technology change, a Plan Amendment will be initiated to place these 25,306 acres under an NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition, 8,078 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) will be managed as open to oil and gas leasing with an NSO stipulation, and 1,539 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) will be closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix A). 					
MIN-20	<p>Saleable Minerals (see Map 12):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 427,273 acres will be open to the disposal of saleable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions. Approximately 806,994 acres will be open to the disposal of saleable minerals subject to CSU and TL stipulations. Approximately 217,480 acres will not be open to the disposal of saleable minerals 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>(in those areas subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas leasing).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 370,250 acres will be closed to the disposal of salable minerals. In addition, 8,078 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) will not be open to the disposal of salable minerals in those lands subject to an NSO stipulation for oil and gas, and 1,539 acres of Federal minerals (split-estate lands) will be closed to the disposal of salable minerals (see Appendix A). 					
MIN-21	<p>Locatable Minerals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 427,273 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to standard terms and conditions. Approximately 962,258 acres are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to CSU and TL 		X			Update IMP (<i>italicized and underlined</i>) to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>stipulations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Approximately 78,333 acres are withdrawn from operations to locatable minerals. Approximately 353,510 acres within WSAs are open to operations for locatable minerals subject to the <u>IMP</u> (1650-1). 					
WC-1	<p>Manage 47,761 acres of non-WSA lands (see Map 16) to protect, preserve, and maintain wilderness characteristics by applying the following prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface- disturbing activities (see Appendix A). Applying a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing to non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics, in combination with the no surface occupancy applied 		X			Wilderness character inventories have been completed since the RMP was approved. A land use plan amendment will be needed to consider the new information and could modify this decision.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>because of the Three Rivers Withdrawal, results in tracts of land which are physically inaccessible to oil and gas operations within the Fisher Towers, Mary Jane Canyon, and Beaver Creek areas. For this reason, portions of non-WSA lands with wilderness characteristics in these areas will be closed to oil and gas leasing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These areas will be managed to preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) including mineral material sales. • Retain public lands in Federal ownership. • Prohibit woodland harvest. • Manage vehicle use as limited to designated roads. • Designate as VRM Class II. • Manage as avoidance areas for ROWs. 					
WC-2	Non-WSA lands to be managed for wilderness characteristics		X			Wilderness character inventories have been

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	include: Beaver Creek (25,722 acres), Fisher Towers (5,540 acres within the Richardson Amphitheater), and Mary Jane Canyon (16,499 acres within the Richardson Amphitheater).					completed since the RMP was approved. A land use plan amendment will be needed to consider the new information and could modify this decision.
PAL-1	Vertebrate fossils may be collected only by qualified individuals under a permit issued by the BLM Utah State Office. Vertebrate fossils include bones, teeth, eggs, and other body parts of animals with backbones such as dinosaurs, fish, turtles, and mammals. Vertebrate fossils also include trace fossils, such as footprints, burrows, gizzard stones, and dung.	X				
PAL-2	Fossils collected under a permit remain the property of the Federal government and must be placed in an approved repository (such as a museum or university) identified at the time of permit issuance.	X				
PAL-3	Locate, evaluate, and protect significant paleontological	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	resources. Provide for public visitation and education opportunities while simultaneously protecting and supporting the scientific and research value of paleontological resources in the MPA.					
PAL-4	Recreational collectors may collect and retain reasonable amounts of common invertebrate and plant fossils for personal, non-commercial use. Surface disturbance must be negligible, and collectors may only use non-power hand tools.	X				
PAL-5	Casting of vertebrate fossils, including dinosaur tracks, is prohibited unless allowed under a scientific/research permit issued by the BLM Utah State Office.	X				
PAL-6	Lands identified for disposal will be evaluated to determine whether such actions would remove significant fossils (see Appendix I) from Federal ownership.	X				
PAL-7	Recognize and protect paleontological resources	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	identified as part of the Dinosaur Diamond National Prehistoric Byway.					
PAL-8	Prohibit petrified wood gathering within the Colorado Riverway Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) to protect these paleontological resources for future public enjoyment. Prohibit private petrified wood collection only near high visitation sites within the Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA. Manage petrified wood gathering outside these two SRMAs to allow for private collection of petrified wood (43 CFR 3620).		X			Also prohibit petrified wood gathering in the Cedar Mountain Formation Wood localities in the Yellow Cat / Cisco areas due to over collecting of conifer and yellow cat redwood.
PAL-9	Prohibit commercial sales of petrified wood products due to limited availability of such resources.	X				
PAL-10	Attach lease notices, stipulations, and other requirements to permitted activities to prevent damage to paleontological resources.	X				
PAL-11	Manage Mill Canyon Dinosaur		X			Add Willow Springs, Mill

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Trail, Copper Ridge Sauropod Trackway, and Poison Spider Track Site as important scientific and public education resources as guided by future SRMA activity-level plans.					Canyon, and Dinosaur Stomping Ground Track Sites.
PAL-12	Personal collection of a reasonable amount of invertebrate and plant fossils will be allowed throughout the MPA. Where areas with rare and significant invertebrate and plant fossils are identified, these areas will be closed to personal collection.	X				
REC-1	Management of recreation will be generally guided by the Utah Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management. The guidelines describe in a broad sense the conditions to be maintained or achieved for rangeland health within the recreation program.	X				
REC-2	Where unacceptable damage to natural or cultural resources by	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recreational use is anticipated or observed, BLM will seek to limit or control activities by managing the nature and extent of the activity or by providing site improvements that make the activity more sustainable or by a combination of management controls and facility development. Such management actions will seek to reduce or eliminate the adverse impact while maintaining the economic benefits associated with a wide range of recreation uses.					
REC-3	BLM will consider and, where appropriate, implement management methods to protect riparian resources, special status species, and wildlife habitat while enhancing recreation opportunities. Management methods may include limitation of visitor numbers, camping and travel controls, implementation of fees, alteration of when use takes place, and other similar	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	actions to be approved through normal BLM procedures.					
REC-4	BLM will coordinate management of recreation use with other agencies, State and local government and tribal units to provide public benefits.	X				
REC-5	Recreational off-highway vehicle (OHV) and mechanized travel will be consistent with area and route designations described in the travel management plan. BLM will work with agency and government officials and permit holders to develop procedures, protocols, permits or other types of authorization, as appropriate, to provide reasonable access for non-recreational use of OHVs for military, search and rescue, emergency, administrative, and permitted uses.	X				
REC-6	Dispersed camping is allowed where not specifically restricted. Dispersed camping may be closed seasonally or as impacts or	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	environmental conditions warrant. All vehicle use associated with dispersed camping activities is required to stay on designated routes.					
REC-7	Management actions limiting camping, wood gathering, firewood cutting, and requiring use of fire pans and portable toilets implemented through published closures limitations, restrictions, or special rules applicable to specific land areas within the MPA are carried forward in all alternatives (see Moab Field Office Recreation Rules in Appendix L).	X				
REC-8	Lands acquired within a management area through future land tenure adjustment will take on the management of the surrounding area.	X				
REC-9	Provide visitor information and outreach programs that emphasize the value of public land resources and low impact recreation techniques while also	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	providing information about recreation activities, experiences and benefits.					
REC-10	Provide public information concerning the prevention of the spread of invasive and exotic weeds, and about wildlife species and their habitat especially in riparian areas.	X				
REC-11	Continue to manage the Slickrock Bike Trail and Fisher Towers Trail as a National Recreation Trails consistent with their current secretarial designation. National Trails designation will be consistent with this plan.	X				
REC-12	Continue supporting public use and enjoyment of the Prehistoric Highway National Scenic Byway. Assist with the development and implementation of a management plan.	X				
REC-13	Support Grand County's efforts to obtain approval of corridor management plans for Utah Scenic Byways (Utah Highways 128, 313, and 279) and provide	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	assistance, where feasible, in the development of byway facilities consistent with other decisions of the RMP.					
REC-14	Continue to manage Kane Creek Road to Hurrah Pass and the roads to Needles, Anticline, and Minor overlooks as Utah Scenic Backways.	X				
REC-15	BLM Back Country Byways and National Recreation Trails may be designated in the future as deemed appropriate with site-specific environmental analysis.	X				
REC-16	Continue managing Kokopelli's Trail to facilitate its use as a potential segment of the American Discovery Trail. Seek to acquire public access along the entire route to facilitate potential designation as a National Recreation Trail.	X				
REC-17	Criteria for establishment of SRMAs, or adding or revising SRMA boundaries (using the Plan Amendment process, where appropriate) include:	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreation use requires intensive management strategies to provide recreation opportunities or maintain resource values. A recreation area management plan or interdisciplinary plan with intensive and specific recreation management actions is approved. BLM announces the management plan and plan approval through media. <p>See Map 17 and Appendix M for SRMA goals, settings, outcomes and management prescriptions.</p>					
REC-18	Generally, where SRMA boundaries are revised, management actions applicable to the original SRMA will also apply to the revised area.	X				
REC-19	Manage all public lands within SRMAs for retention in Federal ownership consistent with the	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	MFO exchange criteria and acquire high value non-Federal lands from willing sellers where such acquisition will further the purposes of each SRMA.					
REC-20	Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) within 0.5 miles of developed recreation sites (current and planned as Potential Future Facilities; see each SRMA).	X				
REC-21	Manage all SRMAs for sustainable camping opportunities. Camping may be restricted to designated sites if use and conditions warrant.	X				
REC-22	Manage all SRMAs according to the Visual Resource Management Class to protect scenic values and settings important to recreation.	X				
REC-23	Approved recreation facilities supporting recreation area management objectives will be planned and designed to reduce visual impacts where feasible (see Visual Resource Management).	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
REC-24	Replace The Colorado River SRMA (24,124 acres) with the Two Rivers, Colorado Riverway and Dolores River Canyons SRMAs (Map 17) to provide for more focused management.	X				
REC-25	Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management actions for activity plan level actions for SRMAs through continuation and modification of approved recreation area management plans (RAMPs) and development of new RAMPs for all SRMAs.	X				
REC-26	A River Management Plan for the Colorado River from the Colorado State Line to Castle Creek, and for the Dolores River, will be completed.	X				
REC-27	Designate SRMAs as either Destination SRMAs (majority of visitation from outside the area), Community SRMAs (the majority of visitation is from the local community), or Undeveloped	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	SRMAs (the focus of the SRMA is to maintain the backcountry setting.					
REC-28	Facilities: Build and maintain additional recreation facilities consistent with the guidance provided in RAMPs and in the various Focus Areas as established in the RMP (Map 18). In the absence of a RAMP, facilities may be considered through the NEPA process where they support the objectives of the SRMA.	X				
REC-29	Facilities: Campground facilities may be constructed; however, they will be located to avoid wetland, riparian, cultural resources, floodplains, and special status plant and animal species habitats. If avoidance is not possible, mitigation will be implemented to augment the values affected by the construction.	X				
REC-30	Facilities: Continue to manage and maintain for recreation use all	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	existing developed recreation sites. Follow site management guidance contained in RAMPs.					
REC-31	Facilities: Continue existing ROWs issued to BLM for all existing developed recreation sites and facilities. Issue similar protective ROWs for all new recreation facilities.	X				
REC-32	Facilities: Manage developed sites as necessary under the authority of 43 CFR Part 8360, inclusive of published closures, restrictions, and supplemental rules developed for the public lands within the MPA (see above), to protect visitor health and safety, reduce visitor conflicts, and provide for the protection of government property and resources.	X				
REC-33	Focus Areas are Recreation Management Zones (RMZ) for emphasizing particular types of recreation activities while still allowing for other uses in accordance with the Travel Plan.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	As RMZs, Focus Areas (Map 18) are established as a mechanism for enhancing specific recreation opportunities through facilities and education such as route marking, parking, camping, and information. Where a single focus SRMA or a specific RMZ (Focus Area) is not identified, the default focus of that area is motorized, backcountry touring on designated roads. The roads are those identified in the Travel Plan accompanying this RMP.					
REC-34	The types of Focus Areas are: Non-mechanized Recreation, Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring, Motorized Backcountry Touring, Scenic Driving Corridors, Specialized Sport Venue Non-motorized, Specialized Sport Venue Motorized, and Managed Open OHV Area.	X				
REC-35	Cameo Cliffs SRMA: Manage the Cameo Cliffs area as a Destination SRMA (15,597 acres) under the Cameo Cliffs		X			Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Recreation Area Management Plan. The Cameo Cliffs SRMA will provide sustainable opportunities for road-related motorized and mechanized outdoor recreation on a marked route system, and provide a non-mechanized hiking and equestrian area in Hook and Ladder Gulch and along the route of the Old Spanish Trail, while protecting and maintaining resource values including range, wildlife habitat, scenic, cultural, historical, recreational, and riparian values in current or improved condition. To facilitate use of the area for touring purposes, no motorized competitive events will be authorized.</p> <p>Work with San Juan County to further implement the Cameo Cliffs portion of the San Juan County All-terrain Vehicle Plan, and to protect and manage wildlife, vegetation, and cultural</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	resources. Implement camping management rules as use levels and resource impacts warrant. Facilities: Install Cameo Cliffs OHV Trailhead toilet.					
REC-36	Canyon Rims SRMA: Manage the Canyon Rims SRMA (101,531 acres) as a Destination SRMA to protect, manage and improve the natural resources of the area while allowing for recreation activities such as developed camping, visiting scenic overlooks, auto touring on the primary road system, touring the secondary road system by motorized vehicle and mountain bike, and hiking and backpacking the canyons (in accordance with the ROS classes) utilizing interpretive and educational opportunities to realize the potential of the area. Major management actions in the Canyon	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Rims SRMA include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the area as open to mineral leasing with controlled surface occupancy except for developed recreation sites, which will be managed as open to leasing with no surface occupancy. • Manage the area to maintain ROS classes as inventoried. • Acquire or exchange private and State lands from willing landowners. • Manage the entire area as OHV travel limited to designated roads. • Manage the western rim land areas of Hatch Point as VRM Class II and the remainder of the area as VRM Class III. • Maintain and/or improve all existing developed recreation sites as specified in the Canyon Rims Recreation Area Management Plan. • Restrict camping near 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>developed recreation sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close the entire recreation area to wood cutting and gathering. • Manage Hatch Wash and the lower section of West Coyote Creek for primitive, non- motorized recreation. • Restrict backcountry motorized events to commercial and non-race special events on the Flat Iron Mesa Jeep Safari route only. • Manage the Windwhistle Nature Trail, Anticline Overlook Trail, Needles Overlook Trail, and Trough Spring Canyon Trail for hiking use only • Consider development of additional trails and recreation facilities only as necessary. <p>Focus Area -- Non-mechanized Recreation (3,642 acres): Hatch</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Wash Hiking and Backpacking Focus Area inclusive of the area from Goodman Canyon to the confluence of Hatch Wash with Kane Creek Canyon including the lower section of West Coyote Creek (from private land west to confluence with Hatch Wash) and the lower section of Troutwater Canyon.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New motorized routes will not be considered in the Hatch Wash Hiking and Backpacking Focus Area. <p>Focus Area -- Scenic Driving Corridors: Needles and Anticline Roads – Utah Scenic Backways. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining Focus Area).</p>					
REC-37	<p>Colorado Riverway SRMA will be established as a Destination SRMA at 89,936 acres. Management will be the same as</p>	X				<p>Map 17 updated and 3,660 acres added to SRMA via plan maintenance action 41. Incorporate changes to</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the Colorado Riverway Recreation Management Area which was established in 1992 and extended in 2001. Management has focused upon providing improvements to sites to facilitate recreation use and protection of scenic and other resource values. Subsequent recreation plan amendments have addressed camping in the Onion Creek area, the construction of a bike lane along SR-128 from the Porcupine Rim Trail to Lion's Park, the construction of a non-motorized bridge on non-Federal land at Lion's Park, and the establishment of a non-mechanized route system in the area between Onion and Professor Creeks. Major management actions in the Colorado Riverway SRMA include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expand the boundary of the Colorado Riverway SRMA to include the lands north of the Entrada Bluffs Road to 					updated e-version.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the boundary of the Two Rivers SRMA, as well as lands south of the Entrada Bluffs Road (one mile corridor).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Colorado Riverway as a Destination SRMA to manage camping, boating, river access, trail, and interpretive facilities in popular areas along or near the Colorado River and to protect the outstanding resource values of the area. Guidance for management is included in the Colorado Riverway Recreation Area Management Plan. • Manage the Dewey Bridge to Castle Creek portion of the Colorado River to provide opportunities for high use boating in a scenic setting (see Boating Management below). • Manage south shore recreation sites (from Dewey 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Bridge to Lion's Park) under the Colorado Riverway RAMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the north shore to provide quality undeveloped designated camping and hiking opportunities while assuring protection of high quality habitat for bighorn sheep as well as for other resource values. • Manage the Kane Creek Crossing area to emphasize responsible designated camping and scenic touring. • Manage the Entrada Bluffs Road area to emphasize designated camping opportunities, and scenic touring. • Manage the Shafer Basin addition to emphasize scenic backcountry driving opportunities (no camping allowed in this area). • Manage the Amphitheater Loop, Fisher Towers, Negro 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Bill Canyon, Hunter Canyon, and Corona Arch trails and Professor Creek to provide high quality hiking-only opportunities while preserving ecological resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for parking and manage the Kings Bench route (above the Kane Creek Road near the Kings Bottom camping area) as a hiking route. Obtain public access from a willing seller across the short section of private land that is located along the route. • Manage the seldom-used 1.5-mile long route (that spurs left from the Poison Spider Mesa Road) on the intermediate bench between the Colorado River and Poison Spider Mesa for hiking use. If future use levels warrant, develop a return hiking trail loop on the 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>river side of the road bed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the proposed Pothole Arch and Rockstacker trails on Amasa Back (Kane Creek) as mountain bike routes. Work with Monticello Field Office to designate the Jackson's Ladder historic horse trail as a mountain bike trail from Jackson's Hole to the Amasa Back Jeep Road. Work with private land owners to secure non-motorized access to the bottom of this route. Manage the Portal Trail to provide both hiking and mountain bike opportunities. Manage the Kane Creek Road to Amasa Back Jeep Road section of the Historic Jackson's Ladder trail as hiking and biking only. Acquire specific tracts of State land. Acquire private lands or scenic easements from 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>willing sellers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restrict motorized and mechanized travel to designated routes. Limit camping and camp fires to designated sites. Close the area to firewood cutting and limiting firewood gathering to riverside driftwood. Limit use of the Fisher Towers, Negro Bill Canyon, Hunter Canyon, and Corona Arch trails to foot travel. Lands along the Colorado River within the Riverway are withdrawn from mineral entry through the Three Rivers Withdrawal. <p>Future Facilities within the Colorado River SRMA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Castle Valley Interpretive Site. Entrada Bluffs Camping Area; camping in this area will be limited to this 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>campground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hittle Bottom Group Campsites. • Kane Creek Crossing Camping Area. Work with SITLA to implement joint camping management in this area. • Kane Creek Road Riverway Information Area • Lower Castle Creek Trail Access. • Poison Spider Dinosaur Track Trail. • Utah Highway 128 Bike Lane. • Utah Highway 279 Riverway Information Area. • Wall Street climbing area toilet. <p>Focus Area -- Negro Bill Hiking and Ecological Study Focus Area: (8,684 acres) inclusive of Negro Bill Canyon between the Sand Flats Recreation Area and the Porcupine Rim Trail.</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Manage for recreational mechanized use on the main portion of the Porcupine Rim Trail from the junction approximately 1.55 miles east of Little Spring (upper exit to Sand Flats Road) to Highway 128 (with the exception of the Porcupine Rim Trail to Coffeepot Rock which will be managed for motorized use.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Negro Bill Canyon Trail for hiking use only. Equestrian use of Negro Bill Canyon will be prohibited. • Manage the Porcupine Rim Trail to provide only hiking and mountain biking opportunities. Management of this trail may change pending resolution of wilderness designation for the Negro Bill Canyon WSA. • No new motorized routes will be considered. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Focus Area -- Richardson Amphitheater/Castle Rock, Hiking, Climbing and Equestrian Focus Area: (24,767 acres) bounded by Fisher Valley, the rim of "Top of the World" escarpment, Highway 128, and non-Federal lands along the east side of the Castle Valley Road. Motorized use allowed on the Fisher Towers Road, the Onion Creek Road, roads serving private ranches and water developments in the Professor Valley area, and the motorized access route to the viewpoint of Professor Valley (the saddle between Adobe Mesa and Castle Rock) and the road to designated undeveloped campsites below Castle Rock. Work with Utah Open Lands (a private land conservation organization) to establish a semi-developed camping area to serve rock climbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Onion Creek Benches equestrian trail system 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>between Onion and Professor Creeks will be managed to provide opportunities for equestrian trail riding. An equestrian-oriented reservable camping area will be managed in Onion Creek upstream from Highway 128. Up to 30 miles of equestrian trails will be marked within this Focus Area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Amphitheater Loop and Fisher Tower Trails for hiking only. • Consider connecting hiking trails between Onion Creek and the Amphitheater Loop Trail. <p>Focus Areas -- Scenic Driving Corridors: These corridors include Highways 128 and 279 (which are both designated Utah Scenic Byways), as well as the Kane Creek/Hurrah Pass portion of the Lockhart Basin Scenic Backway and the BLM portion of</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the LaSal Mountain Loop Road Scenic Backway. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline, or line of sight or to border of adjoining Focus Area (whichever is shorter; see VRM for management prescriptions).</p> <p>Focus Areas -- Specialized Sport Venue, Non-motorized: Tombstone Competitive BASE Jumping Focus Area (42 acres):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Tombstone area to provide BASE jumping opportunities along the Kane Creek Road. BASE jumping will not be allowed in developed recreation sites. <p>Focus Areas -- Specialized Sport Venue, Non-motorized Wall Street Sport Climbing Focus Area (44 acres) (with special protective measures taken for rock art):</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage Wall Street area to provide rock climbing opportunities along the Potash Road. <p>Boating Management: Dewey to Castle Creek: Manage to provide an opportunity for scenic, mild whitewater boating. No restrictions on amount of private use will be established unless unacceptable resource impacts occur. Permit 22 unallocated commercial permits. No further restrictions on amount of commercial use will be established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping will be restricted to designated campsites along the north side of the Colorado River and existing campgrounds on the south side of the Colorado River. 					
REC-38	<p>Dolores River Canyons SRMA (Map 17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage as an undeveloped SRMA (31,661 acres) 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain high quality opportunities for non-motorized boating and day hiking or backpacking in a remote setting supported by basic trailheads, trails, and car camping facilities that support primitive, non-motorized use of the canyon system. Major management actions will include prohibition of motorized and mechanized recreation use within the Dolores River's tributary canyons consistent with the Travel Plan. No new motorized routes will be considered. <p>Boating Management: Colorado State Line to Bridge Canyon: Manage to provide opportunities for scenic whitewater boating trips. Permits required for private and commercial use. Establish maximum group size of 25</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	(excluding guides on commercial trips). Do not establish daily launch limits. Permit 14 unallocated commercial outfitters.					
REC-39	Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA (Map 17): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges area (Map 17) as a Destination SRMA (300,650 acres) BLM manages private boating use in Labyrinth Canyon in conjunction with the Utah Divisions of State Parks and Recreation and Fire, Forestry and State Lands under the terms of a cooperative agreement. The agreement establishes an interagency river permit system and coordinates implementation of common river protection rules including group size and use of fire pans and portable toilets. BLM also issues permits for shoreline use 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>related commercial river trips.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lands along the Green River in Labyrinth Canyon were withdrawn from new entry under the mining laws through the Three Rivers Withdrawal. • Front country type use takes place along SR 313 and the Island in the Sky Road. This highway was designated the Dead Horse Mesa Scenic Byway by the State of Utah in the early 2000s. To manage dispersed camping and protect scenic values, BLM establishes a 1- mile-wide corridor along SR 313 and the Island in the Sky Entrance Road where camping is limited to designated sites, wood cutting and firewood gathering are prohibited, and portable toilets are required. BLM currently limits 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>camping in the corridor to the Horsethief Campground, the Lone Mesa, and Cowboy Camp camping areas. BLM also limits camping and prohibits woodcutting and firewood gathering in a one-mile-wide corridor along the Gemini Bridges Road. Manage the small Cowboy Camp for tent camping and manage the Lone Mesa area for group use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the Mineral Bottom Takeout, BLM manages several additional facilities in the area including the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Interpretive Trail, the Halfway Stage Station Interpretive Site, and the Copper Ridge Sauropod Trackway Interpretive site. BLM also manages and maintains route markings (with user group assistance) on the Monitor and 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Merrimac, Seven Mile Rim, Poison Spider Mesa, Golden Spike, Goldbar Rim, Gemini Bridges, Lower Monitor and Merrimac, Bar M, and Klondike Bluffs routes which are used by both motorized and non-motorized visitors. The 3-D, Crystal Geyser, Hellroaring Rim, Secret Spire, and Wipeout Hill routes are authorized for Jeep Safari and other uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue issuing permits, for both private and commercial users, with common river protection rules for Labyrinth Rims/Gemini Bridges SRMA and consider extending the BLM/State cooperative agreement for management of non-commercial use to include management of commercial river use. If future use levels warrant, relocate the Mineral Bottom Takeout to a more suitable 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>location and initiate cooperative site operations with the National Park Service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit camping to designated sites in high-use areas including the Scenic Driving Corridors and all areas east of the Dubinky Well Road as well as along Ten Mile Wash. • Manage backcountry areas to facilitate scenic motorized touring on designated routes with special emphasis upon establishment of low-development, end of route parking areas and route signing. • Improve the road to the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trailhead to accommodate passenger car traffic. • Consider development of an alternative single-track mountain bike route on Poison Spider Mesa across the mesa top to the top of the 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Portal Trail.</p> <p>Future Facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bartlett Campground: camping in this area will be restricted to this campground. • Lone Mesa Campground: camping in this area will be restricted to this campground. • Blue Hills Road OHV Trailhead. • Courthouse Rock Campground, camping in this area will be restricted to the campground. • Cowboy Camp Campground, camping in this area will be restricted to this campground. • White Wash Sand Dunes OHV Parking and Camping Area. • Gemini Bridges Parking Area and Trailhead. <p>Focus Area -- Scenic Driving Corridors: Highway 313 and the</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Island in the Sky Road (Utah Scenic Byway): Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining Focus Area; see Appendix A).</p> <p>Focus Areas -- Non-Mechanized Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goldbar/Corona Arch Hiking Focus Area (4,191 acres) covers the lands below the Golden Spike OHV route inclusive of the Culvert Canyon drainage to the northern rim of Long Canyon exclusive of the main stem of the Day Point Road. Manage the Corona Arch Trail for hiking only. Develop a hiking loop route in Culvert Canyon from the canyon bottom up to Jeep Arch and back on the western bench of Culvert Canyon to the canyon to just up canyon from the railroad 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>spur. Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) to protect primitive hiking opportunities and scenic values. No new motorized routes will be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring Canyon Hiking Focus Area (457 acres) will be established upstream from the Spring Canyon Bottom Road. No new motorized routes will be considered. • Labyrinth Canyon Canoe Focus Area (7,709 acres) inclusive of the rims along the east side of Labyrinth Canyon from Placer Bottom to Mineral Bottom exclusive of the Hey Joe Mine OHV and mountain bike route. No new motorized routes will be considered. • Seven Mile Canyons Equestrian Focus Area (1,026 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>acres) inclusive of the north and south forks of Seven Mile Canyon westward from the junction of the two canyons. Equestrian use in this area will be restricted to private (non-commercial) horse use. No new motorized routes will be considered.</p> <p>Focus Areas -- Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Klondike Bluffs Mountain Biking Focus Area (14,626 acres) between Arches National Park and U.S. 191. Work with Grand County and SITLA to establish mountain-bike only opportunities in the Klondike area. Manage the Copper Ridge Sauropod Trackway Interpretive Trail for hiking only. • Bar M Mountain Biking Focus Area (2,904 acres) between Arches National Park, U.S. Highway 191, and 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the Bar M area state lands, exclusive of motorized access for the Copper Ridge Jeep Safari Route and the 191 rock quarry access road. Convert existing routes to mechanized use and provide for a limited number of new and connecting routes to support use of area as the destination for the 191 bike lane. Recommend that the old highway route in Moab Canyon be managed for non-motorized use to facilitate use of the route as part of the 191 bike lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tusher Slickrock Mountain Biking Focus Area (428 acres) on slickrock between Bartlett and Tusher Washes with main access from Bartlett Wash to reduce traffic in Tusher Canyon. Manage the Tusher Canyon slickrock and Bartlett slickrock areas for mountain 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>bike and hiking use only. Cross-country mountain biking across slick rock will be allowed throughout this area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Canyon/Upper Courthouse Mountain Biking Focus Area (5,744 acres) inclusive of areas within the Mill Canyon and upper Courthouse drainages with continued use of the Seven Mile Rim Jeep Safari route for motorized use, with non-motorized trailheads near the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trail and the Halfway Stage Station. Manage the Mill Canyon Dinosaur Trail for hiking only (35 miles of road designated for motorized travel; 23 miles of route managed for mechanized use only). <p>Focus Area -- Motorized Backcountry Touring:</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gemini Bridges/Poison Spider Mesa Focus Area (16,299 acres) for multiple use, including full-size OHV, ATV, and motorcycle use with consideration given to managing routes suitable for each vehicle type. Travel will be intensively managed on designated routes only. Close the spur route to Gemini Bridges to facilitate public use and help restore damaged lands along the spur route. Construct a parking area near the bridges. <p>Focus Areas -- Specialized Sport Venue (Non-motorized):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mineral Canyon/Horsethief Point Competitive BASE Jumping Focus Area (762 acres) is established. Bartlett Slickrock Freeride Focus Area (166 acres) is established. No man-made structures will be added to 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>facilitate "stunt riding."</p> <p>Focus Areas – Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dee Pass Motorized Trail Focus Area (35,290 acres) for motorcycle and ATV use: This is the area for competitive motorized events. Competitive routes within this area will be identified based on site-specific NEPA analysis. All routes designated for motorized use in the accompanying Travel Plan will remain open while Section 106 cultural resource inventories are conducted. If these inventories indicate the presence of eligible sites within the travel corridor, the route will be altered or closed. All new routes will require Section 106 cultural resource inventory prior to designation. Establish a 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>managed OHV route system with provision for ongoing management of existing single-track routes to maintain their single-track character.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Airport Hills Motocross Focus Area (285 acres): Manage the Focus Area for motocross use in partnership with local government under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act. A patent will be issued to local government. <p>Focus Area – Managed OHV area (cross country travel allowed):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> White Wash Sand Dunes Open OHV Focus Area, (1,866 acres) encompassing the area around the dunes themselves. Manage the central portion of the White Wash Sand Dunes for motorized sand play with 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>exception of the dune field cottonwood trees and White Wash water sources which will be closed to motorized travel and fenced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit camping use in the White Wash Sand Dunes area to designated sites and establish basic camping facilities on the bench on the north side of White Wash. Implement a fee system, under the guidelines of the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act, to help fund cost of intensive management of the White Wash Sand Dunes area. 					
REC-40	<p>Lower Gray Canyon SRMA (Map17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage as a Destination SRMA in coordination with the Price Field Office. Manage river recreation in accordance with the Desolation-Gray Canyons Management Plan. 	X				Does not yet have a completed Recreation Area Management Plan.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the existing riverside and the parallel bench route loop trails from Nefertiti Rapid to Rattlesnake Canyon for hiking and equestrian use. Vehicle camping limited to designated sites 					
REC-41	<p>Sand Flats Area SRMA (Map 17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage as a Destination SRMA (6,246 acres). Guidance for management is included in the Sand Flats RAMP, which was approved in August of 1994, and is supported by the June 1994 Cooperative Agreement with Grand County, which authorizes the county to collect fees for the benefit of the recreation area and participate in the operational management of the area to help implement the recreation area management plan. The following decisions are carried forward 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>from these plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acquisition of State lands through exchange. - Provision for entrance and use fees. - Development of campgrounds. - Potential development of a drinking water source. - Provision for parking lots at the Slickrock and Little Spring trailheads. - Installation of toilets. - Development of an entrance station. - Provision for visitor protection. - Information and various services. - Limit camping to designated sites. - Limit OHV and mountain bike travel to designated routes. - Prohibit wood collecting and gathering. - Close the Moab Slickrock 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Bike Trail to four-wheeled vehicles and ATV use for safety purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Slickrock Bike Trail is open to motorcycles and mountain bikes only. - Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) to protect recreation and scenic values. 					
REC-42	<p>South Moab SRMA (Map 17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the South Moab SRMA (Map 17) as a Destination SRMA (63,999 acres). • Provide emphasis upon development of non-motorized trails through agreements with neighboring land owners through preparation of management guidance covering the Ken's 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Lake area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Grand and San Juan counties to establish the New Spanish Trail Bicycle Lane to provide safe bicycle access from Canyonlands Field to the Pack Creek Picnic Area. • Work with Moab City and Grand County to extend the Mill Creek Parkway to the Power Dam trailhead to provide safe access for cyclists and hikers. • Formalize and continue the existing partnership with the water district to share management expenses at Ken's Lake. • Manage the Mill Creek Power Dam hiking trailhead, the Ken's Lake Recreation Site, the Hidden Valley hiking trailhead and the Blue Hill multi-use trailhead as recreation sites. Continue to manage the Mill 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Creek Canyon hiking trails, the Ken's Lake hiking trail system, the Hidden Valley Hiking trail, the Steelbender/Flat Pass OHV/ mountain bike route, the Behind the Rocks OHV route, the Strike Ravine OHV route, and the Kane Creek Canyon Rim OHV/mountain bike route as recreation routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit camping to designated sites and prohibit wood gathering and cutting along the Black Ridge Road, the Pack Creek Road, the LaSal Mountain Loop Road and the Kane Creek Canyon Rim Road out to the Picture Frame Arch area. Prohibit camping on the west side of Spanish Valley, and in Mill Creek. • Manage Ken's Lake as a developed recreation site in partnership with the holders 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>of the ROW for Ken's Lake (Spanish Valley Water and Sewer District).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Mill Creek Canyon planning area in accordance with the approved interdisciplinary Mill Creek Canyon Management Plan. • Work with Grand County, SITLA, and private land owners to establish the "Power line" trail along the west side of Moab and Spanish Valleys from Kane Creek Road near the river portal south via the Hidden Valley Trailhead to the southern end of the Behind the Rocks area. • Work with San Juan and Grand Counties, SITLA, and private land owners to establish the Red Rock Horse Trail along the east side of Spanish Valley via Ken's Lake from the Johnson's Up-on-Top Road to the Loop 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Road/Pack Creek junction area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work with the Backcountry Horsemen, SITLA and San Juan County to establish equestrian riding loop routes south from the Ken's Lake Trailhead. <p>Focus Area -- Scenic Driving Corridors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LaSal Mountain Loop Road Scenic Backway. Manage for scenic driving enjoyment. The corridor is defined as: having a width of 1/2 mile from centerline (or to border of adjoining Focus Area) (see Appendix A). <p>Focus Areas -- Non-mechanized Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mill Creek Canyon Hiking Focus Area (16,950 acres) inclusive of the north and south forks of Mill Creek, Rill Creek, and Burkholder 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Draw south to the LaSal Mountain Loop Road with motorized use limited to the Steelbender OHV route and routes identified in the Travel Plan for this alternative. Emphasize management of the core area of Mill Creek to provide primitive hiking opportunities. Commercial equestrian use of Mill Creek Canyon and its tributaries will be prohibited except for use along the Steelbender/Flat Pass OHV/mountain bike route. No new motorized routes will be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Behind the Rocks Hiking Focus Area (17,536 acres) inclusive of the area currently closed to motorized use in the 1985 RMP and the Hunter Canyon area between Pritchett Canyon and the eastern rim of Kane Creek Canyon exclusive of the 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Pritchett Canyon and Behind the Rocks OHV route. Manage the Hunter Canyon trail for hiking only. Emphasize management of the core area of Behind the Rocks to provide primitive hiking opportunities. No new motorized routes will be considered.</p> <p>Focus Area -- Mountain Bike Backcountry Touring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upper Spanish Valley Mountain Biking Focus Area (2,255 acres; Mud Spring Area) for development of a beginner to intermediate skill level mountain bike trail system through conversion of existing routes and development of new routes. Work with SITLA to expand route system on adjacent state lands. <p>Focus Area -- Specialized Sport</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Venue (Non-motorized):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 24 Hours of Moab Focus Area (2,905 acres) will be established to facilitate mountain bike speed-related events. <p>Focus Area -- Specialized Sport Venue (Motorized):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potato Salad Hill Climbing Focus Area (41 acres) will be established within the boundary of the fenced areas emphasizing hill climbing events. Parking limitations will be established to limit vehicle group size. 					
REC-43	<p>Two Rivers SRMA (Map 17):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage the Two Rivers SRMA (29,839 acres) as a Destination SRMA with the objective of continuing to provide distinct, high quality opportunities for recreational boating and camping, and to protect the outstanding resource values. Use launch 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>systems and campsite assignments to reduce inter-party contacts.</p> <p>Boating Management -- State Line to Westwater Ranger Station: Manage for relatively high use flat water boating in conjunction with the Ruby/Horsethief Canyons section in Colorado. Co- administer a private boating or parking permit system and user limitations and fees in conjunction with Colorado BLM as a means of providing for adequate take-out.</p> <p>Boating Management -- Westwater Canyon: Manage to provide an opportunity for whitewater boating in a primitive and remote setting. Permits required for private and commercial use. Distribute potential use levels equally from May 1 to September 30 (allocation season) between private and</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>commercial sectors (including guides). Establish maximum private group size of 25 people and a daily launch limit of 75 people. For commercial use, establish a maximum trip size of 25 passengers, plus one crew member per passenger carrying craft, plus two additional crew. Establish a commercial daily launch limit of 75 passengers. Permit 18 commercial outfitters.</p> <p>Boating Management -- Cisco Landing to Dewey Bridge: Manage to provide an opportunity for scenic flat water boating or as an extension of Westwater Canyon trips. For private use, no restrictions on amount of use will be established. Permit 22 unallocated commercial permits. No further restrictions on amount of commercial use will be established. Manage the Dewey Bridge Recreation Site under the Colorado Riverway RAMP.</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Boating Management -- Dolores River from Bridge Canyon to its confluence with the Colorado River: Manage to provide opportunity for scenic whitewater boating trips. Permits required for private and commercial use. Establish maximum group size of 25 (excluding guides on commercial trips). Do not establish daily launch limits. Permit 14 unallocated commercial outfitters.</p> <p>Future Facilities: Acquire additional lands at the Westwater Ranger Station to include additional camping, parking and launch facilities. Seek to develop a take-out facility separate from the Westwater Ranger Station launch ramp to reduce congestion at the ranger station. Seek opportunities to expand legal and physical access to facilitate camping at the Ranger Station.</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Focus Area -- Non-mechanized Recreation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish the Westwater Canyon River Use and Hiking Focus Area (23,479 acres) inclusive of Westwater Canyon along the Colorado River between Westwater Ranch and Rose Ranch and the surrounding uplands. New motorized routes will not be considered. 					
REC-44	Utah Rims SRMA (Map 17): Manage Utah Rims as a Community SRMA (15,424 acres) to provide sustainable opportunities for motorized, mechanized and non-motorized route related recreation while protecting and maintaining resource values including range, wildlife habitat, scenic, cultural, recreational, and riparian values in current or improved condition. Work with Colorado BLM to coordinate management of the	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Utah Rims and Rabbit Valley Colorado areas. Management actions will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the Kokopelli's Trail for recreation use. • Manage Bitter Creek Campsite for camping. • Limit motorized and mechanized travel to a designated road and route system, including where feasible, the establishment and management of a network of single-track routes. • Acquisition of public access across non-Federal lands for the route system. • Development of a staging area. • Potential separation of types of single-track route use by time period. • Limited provision of camping facilities. • Prohibition of competitive, motorized events on the 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>single-track route system to maintain its single-track nature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add single-track routes to the route system on a case-by-case basis pending resolution of resource concerns. 					
REC-45	<p>Extensive Recreation Management Area: Manage all lands within the MPA not within an SRMA as the Moab Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA; see Map 17 and Appendix M).</p> <p>ERMA lands may be designated as SRMAs in the future based on intensity of use and will be analyzed through the plan amendment process.</p> <p>Minimal facilities may be constructed in the ERMA as needed to insure visitor health and safety, reduce user conflict, and protect resources.</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Provide general recreation management guidance and subsequent implementation of management actions for activity plan level actions for the Moab ERMA through development of a Recreation Area Management Plan (RAMP). Address both site-related issues (development and management in response to user demand and changing conditions) and backcountry management issues (the retention of backcountry characteristics, e.g., low level of development, relative lack of crowding, and feeling of remoteness).</p> <p>Amend the RMP, as necessary, for RMP level recreation and non-recreation actions proposed through the RAMP developed subsequent to RMP approval.</p> <p>Manage OHV travel as limited to designated routes or closed,</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>depending on the specific area (see Travel Management section, beginning on page 2-47).</p> <p>Monitor recreation activity in the Moab ERMA to maintain recreation opportunities and protect resource values.</p> <p>Continue making improvements to sites and areas as necessary and supported by activity and project level planning to balance demand for recreation opportunities and protection of the recreation resource base.</p> <p>Continue to manage the Utah portion of the Kokopelli's Trail as a multi-day mountain bike and vehicle route (in part) with associated camping areas.</p> <p>Develop basic camping and trailhead facilities to serve the Lost Spring Canyon area should use levels and impacts warrant.</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Construct information boards at the main exits along I-70 to inform visitors about recreation opportunities, travel management, low impact recreation techniques, and visitor safety issues.</p> <p>Upper Fisher Mesa (1,365 acres) will be managed to emphasize mountain biking. BLM will convert existing roads and provide new connecting routes for bicycle use in conjunction with the existing bike route within the Manti-LaSal National Forest. Motorized access will be retained along the main existing Fisher Mesa access road.</p> <p>Manage the Bookcliffs area (335,457 acres) for non-mechanized recreation, especially equestrian use, hiking, backpacking and big game hunting. It will be managed for low frequency of visitor</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>interaction by not establishing new motorized or mechanized recreation routes, no commercial motorized permits will be issued, and competitive events will not be allowed.</p> <p>Manage the Sego Canyon Rock Art Site as a day use recreation area. Consider acquisition of the adjacent private rock art area north of the interpretive site to expand interpretive opportunities.</p>					
REC-46	<p>Special Recreation Permits (SRPs): SRPs are issued as a discretionary action as a means to: help meet management objectives, provide opportunities for economic activity, facilitate recreational use of the public lands, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors. Cost recovery procedures for issuing SRPs will be applied where appropriate.</p>	X				
REC-47	Priority for authorization of new	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	SRPs for events are given to applicants proposing uses that: do not duplicate existing events; take place outside of March, April, May, and October; make use of less-crowded weekdays; utilize facilities off public lands for overnight accommodation of guests; display and communicate the Canyon Country Minimum Impact Practices; and focus visitation on sites and areas capable of withstanding repeated use.					
REC-48	All SRPs will contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include additional stipulations necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns.	X				
REC-49	There will be no competitive mechanized or motorized events in Wilderness Study Areas while these areas are managed under the IMP.		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.
REC-50	Issue and manage special	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	recreation permits for a wide variety of uses to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities, provide opportunities for private enterprise, manage user-group interaction, and limit the impacts of such uses upon natural and cultural resources. Organized group permits required for groups with 25 or more vehicles (one driver/vehicle).					
RIP-1	Manage riparian resources for PFC, which is described as the presence of adequate vegetation, landforms, or large woody debris, in accordance with the Utah Standards for Public Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah and with the Grazing Guidelines for Grazing Management.	X				
RIP-2	Retain the Between the Creeks, North Sand Flats, and South Sand Flats Allotments as not available for grazing to benefit riparian resources. These	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	allotments include the following streams: Negro Bill Canyon, portions of Mill Creek, and Rill Creek.					
RIP-3	<p>Mitigation to reduce impacts to floodplains and riparian areas include (from Standards for Public Land Health and Guidelines for Recreation Management for BLM Lands in Utah and BLM Riparian Manual 1737):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where feasible and consistent with user safety, developed travel routes will be located/relocated away from sensitive riparian/wetland areas. • Camping in riparian areas will be avoided and must be managed, monitored, and modified as conditions dictate to reduce vegetation disturbance and sedimentation. • Stream crossings will be limited in number dictated by the topography, geology, 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>and soil type. Design any necessary stream crossings to minimize sedimentation, soil erosion and compaction (minimize longitudinal routes along stream banks, design crossings perpendicular to the stream).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where necessary, control recreational use by changing location or kind of activity, season, intensity, distribution and/or duration. Grazing actions to meet riparian objectives include vegetation use limits, fencing, herding, change of livestock class, temporary closures, change of season, and/or alternate development or relocation of water sources. Any water diversions from riparian areas by BLM or non-BLM entities will be designed and constructed to protect ecological processes 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and functions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement weed management stipulations and education to reduce spread of noxious weeds along stream corridors. 					
RIP-4	To the extent possible, mineral removal and lease development (including placer mining) must be located away from water's edge and outside of riparian/wetland zones.	X				
RIP-5	Limit activities in riparian areas, as necessary, to achieve and maintain PFC.	X				
RIP-6	Grazing actions to meet riparian objectives can include fencing, herding, change of livestock class, temporary closures, and/or change of livestock season of use.	X				
RIP-7	Preclude surface-disturbing activities within 100-year floodplains and within 100 meters of riparian areas, public water reserves, and springs.	X				
RIP-8	Prioritize restoration activities in riparian systems that are	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Functioning at Risk or Non-functioning.					
RIP-9	Continue to apply integrated species management to accomplish riparian restoration through biological, chemical, mechanical, and manual methods (e.g., tamarisk control, willow plantings).	X				
RIP-10	Acquire riparian lands and water resources (from willing sellers) to preserve and maintain riparian habitat and instream flow.	X				
RIP-11	Do not dispose of riparian or wetland resources unless resource loss is mitigated.	X				
RIP-12	Develop watershed management plans for impaired systems as identified in current TMDL reports (e.g., Onion Creek, Mill Creek, and Castle Creek).	X				
RIP-13	Close riparian areas to woodcutting, except where permitted for traditional cultural practices identified for Native Americans or for restoration to benefit riparian values.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
RIP-14	Establish Lower South Fork of Seven Mile Canyon as a Riparian/Wetland Demonstration Area for the improvement and restoration of riparian, wetland and wildlife resources.	X				
RIP-15	Grazing will not be authorized on portions of the following streams (listed with affected allotments): the Colorado River from Dewey Bridge to Hittle Bottom (Professor Valley), and Lower Kane Creek (Kane Creek Springs).		X			Add “ <i>Cattleguard</i> ” after Hittle Bottom to avoid confusion.
RIP-16	Management strategies will be implemented to restore degraded riparian communities, protect natural flow requirements, protect water quality, and manage for year-round flow.	X				
RIP-17	Grazing Actions: Evaluate non-functioning and functioning at risk riparian areas using Standards for Rangeland Health and Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management to determine if restriction from grazing will improve riparian functioning	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	condition. The following riparian areas will be given priority for evaluation: Ten Mile from Dripping Spring to the Green River, Mill Creek, Seven Mile Canyon, and East Coyote (totaling 1,420 acres).					
RIP-18	Grazing Actions: Cottonwood, Bogart, Pear Park and Diamond Allotments (which include Cottonwood and Diamond Canyons) will continue to be not available to grazing to benefit riparian resources. Castle Valley will also not be available for grazing. Spring Creek will be available for grazing.	X				<p>The newly created Round Mountain Allotment is located in Castle Valley on what was previously State land, which had a grazing permit issued by the State. The land exchange agreement recognizes all valid existing rights of the state lands exchanged and allows grazing to continue. This allotment is not part of the 6,074 acres described in this section.</p> <p>It is anticipated that AUMs will be unavailable to grazing once existing permit expires (year 2026).</p>
RIP-19	Season-of-Use: Season of use adjustments will be made on a	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	case-by-case basis to achieve PFC.					
RIP-20	Watershed Management Plans: Prioritize development and implementation of the Watershed Management Plans and riparian studies for the following areas: Ten Mile Wash, Kane Springs, Bartlett Wash, Tusher Wash, Mill Canyon, Courthouse Wash, Cottonwood-Diamond, and Onion Creek.	X				
SOL-WAT-1	Comply with all State, Federal and local laws to protect municipal watersheds (Thompson, Moab, and Castle Valley), and watersheds of any public or private water supply such as Windwhistle Campground, Westwater Ranger Station, La Sal Creek, and Browns Hole.	X				
SOL-WAT-2	Coordinate with Utah Division of Oil, Gas, and Mining to remediate existing Abandoned Mine Lands sites.	X				
SOL-WAT-3	Comply with Floodplain Executive Order 11988.	X				
SOL-	BLM will work with partners to	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WAT-4	implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) and continue BLM's cooperative work with the Utah Divisions of Water Rights and Water Quality in accordance with the administrative memorandum of understanding (MOU) and the cooperative agreement addressing water quality monitoring.					
SOL-WAT-5	Allow no surface occupancy and preclude surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) within 100-year floodplains, within 100 meters of a natural spring, or within public water reserves.	X				Note: Moab MLP planning process is using drainages marked on USGS 24k maps to identify 100-year floodplains.
SOL-WAT-6	In cooperation with Grand and San Juan Counties, develop BMPs for road maintenance and construction in high risk areas (e.g., floodplains, riparian zones, and areas with sensitive soils).	X				
SOL-WAT-7	Continue management of the Mill Creek planning area in accordance with the Mill Creek Management Plan (2001).	X				
SOL-	Develop watershed management	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WAT-8	plans for municipal watersheds to ensure water sources are protected adequately. Monitor municipal water quality/watershed conditions.					
SOL-WAT-9	To protect sensitive soils on slopes, apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) prohibiting surface-disturbing activities on slopes in the Bookcliffs (see Map 19) greater than 30% from November 1 to April 30. This restriction includes road construction and traffic on existing roads associated with initial drilling operations. In addition, apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) on slopes greater than 30% throughout the MPA.		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.
SOL-WAT-10	Follow Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) recommendations on 303(d) listed streams,		X			Add “ <i>and 305(b)</i> ”. Add new 303(d) listed

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	currently Mill, Castle, and Onion Creeks.					streams: Kane; Cottonwood; Professor; Westwater; Diamond.
SOL-WAT-11	Minimize surface disturbance in areas identified as having "sensitive soils" unless long-term impacts can be mitigated.	X				
SOL-WAT-12	Maintain vegetation based on desired future condition to provide adequate ground cover to prevent accelerated erosion in wind erodible soils.	X				
SOL-WAT-13	Apply environmental BMPs to all oil and gas authorizations in accordance to WO IM 2007-021 and the most current version of the "Goldbook."		X			Change "WO IM 2007-021" to " <i>most current policy</i> ". Apply to other IM references throughout the plan. Ensure that BMPs identified in the RMP are reflective of the most current agency BMPs.
SOL-WAT-14	Develop BMPs to address health and safety concerns associated with blowing dust along U.S. 191 and I-70.	X				Ongoing process.
SOL-WAT-15	Maintain or improve soil quality and long-term soil productivity through the implementation of Standards for Rangeland Health	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and other soil protection measures.					
SOL-WAT-16	Manage uses to minimize and mitigate damage to soils.	X				
SOL-WAT-17	Maintain and/or restore overall watershed health and reduce erosion, stream sedimentation, and salinization of water.	X				
SOL-WAT-18	Coordinate with Grand Water and Sewer Service Agency to ensure required minimum instream flow of 3.0 cfs in Mill Creek below the Sheley diversion.	X				
SOL-WAT-19	Implement portions of Greater Sagers Wash Watershed Management Plan that pertain to surface disturbance.	X				
SOL-WAT-20	No additional OHV routes will be allowed in saline soils other than those already designated in the Travel Plan accompanying this RMP (see Appendix N). An exception will be considered on a case-by-case basis for proposed routes in the Dee Pass Motorized Focus Area and in the Utah Rims SRMA. Exceptions could also be considered on a case-by-case	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	basis outside these two areas if potential impacts could be mitigated and if the action will benefit other natural and cultural resources.					
SOL-WAT-21	Develop BMPs for activities on saline and other sensitive soils.		X			Need to ensure that RMP BMPs are reflective of most current agency BMPs.
SOL-WAT-22	Specific recommendations regarding surface and subsurface pipeline crossings found in Guidance for Pipeline Crossings (see Appendix O) will be implemented to prevent breakage and subsequent contamination.	X				
SOL-WAT-23	Implement guidelines from Technical Reference 1730-2, where feasible, to protect or restore the functions of biological soil crusts.	X				
SOL-WAT-24	Manage public lands in a manner consistent with the Colorado River Salinity Control Program, implementing BMPs and watershed restoration projects to reduce salinity contributions to the Colorado River system.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SOL-WAT-25	Aquifers/Watersheds: Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation to oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities in the Castle Valley watershed in order to protect the sole source, unconfined, surficial aquifer.	X				
SOL-WAT-26	Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation to oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities in the Mill Creek-Spanish Valley watershed in order to protect the aquifer for the Moab area.	X				
SOL-WAT-27	Saline Soils in Mancos Shale: To minimize watershed damage on saline soils in the Mancos Shale, apply a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) prohibiting surface-disturbing activities on 330,142 acres of moderately to highly saline soils in the Mancos Shale (see Map 20) from December 1 to May 31. This		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP planning area. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	restriction includes road construction and traffic on existing roads associated with drilling operations					
SOL-WAT-28	Grazing: Use grazing systems and develop AMPs to minimize impacts to saline Soils.	X				
SOL-WAT-29	Watershed Management Plans: Prioritize development and implementation of the Watershed Management Plans for the following areas: Ten Mile Wash, Kane Springs, Bartlett Wash, Tusher Wash, Mill Canyon, Courthouse Wash, Cottonwood-Diamond, and Onion Creek.	X				Additional funding and resources needed to completed this work.
ACEC-1	Designate, modify and manage areas as ACECs (see Map 21) where special management attention is required to protect and prevent irreparable damage to important historic, cultural, or scenic values, fish and wildlife resources, or other natural systems or processes, or to protect life and safety from natural hazards. In those areas where ACECs		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	overlap with WSAs, the WSA management prescriptions, as stipulated in the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP), will take precedence.					
ACEC-2	ACECs will be avoidance areas for all ROWs, including wind, solar energy and communication sites.	X				
ACEC-3	<p>Behind the Rocks (5,201 acres) will be designated as an ACEC. This area excludes the Behind the Rocks WSA, which will be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.</p> <p>Special Management: To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems (threatened, sensitive and endangered plants), cultural resources and scenery, the following management prescriptions will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate as VRM Class II. • No vegetation treatments (except for exotic/noxious 		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>weeds).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural resources in Behind the Rocks ACEC will be prioritized for Class III inventory. • Vehicle-based camping only in campgrounds. No campfires outside of campgrounds. • No new motorized or mechanized routes; motorized/mechanized travel limited to designated routes. • Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface- disturbing activities (see Appendix A). • No commercial or private use of woodland products. 					
ACEC-4	<p>Cottonwood-Diamond Watershed (35,830 acres) will be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>Special Management: To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems, and to mitigate</p>		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the natural hazards due to fire, the following management prescriptions will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to keep area not available to livestock grazing. • Close to vehicle use at the end of the Class B-road system, except for administrative access. • No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes outside the WSA, and closed in the WSA. • No competitive events. • Suspend commercial permits (guiding or special groups). • ACEC will only be designated until hazard is no longer present. At that point, management will revert to the IMP. • About 34,027 acres within the WSA are closed to oil and gas leasing, and the remaining 1,804 acres will be 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	managed as no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing. Other surface-disturbing activities will be precluded (see Appendix A).					
ACEC-5	<p>Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon (13,500 acres) will be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>Special Management: To protect the relevant and important values of scenery, wildlife, natural systems (threatened, sensitive, and endangered plants), and cultural resources, the following management prescriptions will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate Highway 279 and Long Canyon as VRM Class II; manage the remainder of the ACEC as VRM I. • Permitted activities will be confined to main roads within crucial bighorn lambing habitat from April 1 through June 15. This 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>restriction will not apply to filming if the filming meets the minimum impact criteria (see Appendix H).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wall Street rock art sites will be managed for public use with the emphasis on interpretation. • Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes. • Vehicle-based camping only in designated campgrounds. • No campfires except in campgrounds. • Retain ACEC in public ownership except for the previously initiated Moab Salt Exchange Parcel (635 acres). Manage the entire area as no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities. 					
ACEC-6	<p>Mill Creek Canyon (3,721 acres) will be designated as an ACEC. This area excludes the Mill Creek</p>		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Canyon WSA. The Mill Creek Canyon WSA (9,780 acres) will be managed according to the IMP to protect wilderness values.</p> <p>Special Management: To protect the relevant and important values of cultural resources, scenery, natural systems: (cold water fishery/riparian/watershed and wildlife), the following management prescriptions will apply to 3,721 acres in the ACEC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation activities will be managed according to the South Moab SRMA. • Prioritize Mill Creek for Class III cultural inventory. • Protect Native American traditional cultural places. • Designate as VRM Class II. • Livestock grazing will not be available. • No vehicle-based camping. • No campfires in riparian areas. • Motorized competitive 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>events will be prohibited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No new mechanized or motorized routes. Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes. • All recreational events will be confined to the designated roads in the ACEC. • Limit recreation facility development to day-use only. • Acquire state land within ACEC as the opportunity arises. • Maintain 3 cfs in the South Fork of Mill Creek below the Sheley diversion. • Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface- disturbing activities (see Appendix A). • No recreational mining will be allowed. • No fuel wood harvesting 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>permits will be issued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private wood gathering for backpacking campfires will be allowed in the uplands only. 					
ACEC-7	<p>Ten Mile Wash (4,980 acres) will be designated as an ACEC.</p> <p>Special Management: To protect the relevant and important values of natural systems (riparian/wetlands), wildlife, cultural resources and natural hazards, the following management prescriptions will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prioritize Ten Mile for Class III cultural inventory. Prioritize Ten Mile as a scientific research area. Grazing will be allowed on a limited basis in Ten Mile Canyon downstream from Dripping Springs, with changes subject to future monitoring and conformance with Standards for Rangeland 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Health.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize area for riparian restoration. • Restrict camping and campfires to designated sites at Dripping Spring. • Motorized and mechanized travel limited to designated routes. • No competitive events. • Establish speed limits. • Reroute designated road around the wetlands south of the cattle guard near Dripping Springs. • Restrict vehicle access at the Green River; designate a parking area at the Green River. • Permits for motorized recreational use may be required if monitoring indicates long-term damage. • Require permits for groups greater than 25 vehicles. • Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>and gas leasing and preclude other surface- disturbing activities (see Appendix A).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No commercial or private collection of woodland products. 					
TRA-1	<p>Segments of the Old Spanish Trail will be identified and classified for historic integrity and condition. These segments will then be designated for appropriate types of management and travel.</p>		X			<p>Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.</p> <p>Segments have been identified. Designations for types of management and travel have yet to be completed.</p>
TRA-2	<p>Landmarks along the Old Spanish Trail will be identified for historic integrity and interpreted only if the action will not impact the values at the site. All interpretation projects will be done in consultation with Native Americans and other interested parties including the Old Spanish Trail Association and National Park Service.</p>		X			<p>Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.</p> <p>Casa Colorado has been identified as a historic landmark to be nominated for the National Register of Historic Places.</p> <p>Note: Internal consultation includes BLM's Old Spanish</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						National Historic Trail Coordinator.
TRA-3	Consider plan amendment, as necessary, to incorporate provisions of the forthcoming Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Management Plan.		X			Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.
TRA-4	Participate in the development of the management plan for the Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Management Plan and assist with its implementation as opportunities arise, consistent with other decisions of the RMP.		X			Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.
TRA-5	Support protective management, interpretation, and public enjoyment and understanding of the National Historic Old Spanish Trail, consistent with the Old Spanish Trail Comprehensive Management Plan.		X			Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.
TRA-6	Seek to acquire public access to the site of the Old Spanish Trail ford of the Green River, upstream from the town of Green River, Utah, for the purpose of developing an interpretive site.		X			Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
TRA-7	Consistent with the Cameo Cliffs and Canyon Rims Recreation Area Management Plans (RAMPs), consider developing and managing a section of the Old Spanish Trail for equestrian use.		X			Old Spanish Trail should be referred to as Old Spanish National Historic Trail.
WSR-1	River segments found suitable and recommended for designation will be managed to protect their free-flowing condition and to protect the outstandingly remarkable values and maintain the tentative classification within line-of-sight up to 1/4 mile (1/3 miles on the Colorado and Dolores Rivers) from the high water mark on each bank of the river (not to exceed 320 acres per mile). Management that will apply should any rivers be designated by Congress is identified in BLM Manual 8351.51 (see Appendix P and Map 22 for river segments found suitable for WSR designation).	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WSR-2	BLM will not seek water rights as part of a suitability decision made in the Record of Decision for this RMP.	X				
WSR-3	WSR segments recommended as suitable for Wild will be designated as VRM Class I, closed to oil and gas leasing and closed to motorized travel; Scenic and Recreational segments will be designated as VRM Class II, managed with a no surface occupancy for oil and gas leasing and other surface disturbing activities, and managed with travel limited to designated routes.	X				
WSR-4	OHV travel will be limited to designated routes or closed, depending on the river segment.	X				
WSR-5	The stipulations that will be applied to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities within suitable river segments have been developed based on other resource values such as scenery, wildlife and fisheries, riparian, and recreation. In all	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	cases, these stipulations are sufficient to protect the outstandingly remarkable values. All suitable segments will be managed with a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing as well as all other surface-disturbing activities, or as closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix A and Map 12 for the surface stipulations application to oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities).					
WSR-6	BLM will work with the State of Utah, local and tribal governments, and other federal agencies, in a state-wide study, to reach consensus regarding recommendations to Congress for the inclusion of rivers in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Besides applying consistent criteria across agency jurisdictions, the joint study will avoid piecemealing of river segments in logical watershed units in the state. The study will	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>evaluate, in detail, the possible benefits and effects of designation on the local and state economies, agricultural and industrial operations and interests, outdoor recreation, natural resources (including the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was deemed suitable), water rights, water quality, water resource planning, and access to and across river corridors within, and upstream and downstream from the proposed segment(s). Actual designation of river segments will only occur through congressional action or as a result of Secretarial decision at the request of the Governor in accordance with provisions of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (the Act). BLM will work with the State, local and tribal governments, and the agencies involved, to coordinate its decision making on wild and scenic river issues and to achieve</p>					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	consistency wherever possible.					
WSR-7	BLM recognizes that water resources on most river and stream segments within the State of Utah are already fully allocated. Before stream segments that have been recommended as suitable under this Approved RMP are recommended to Congress for designation, BLM will continue to work with affected local, state, federal and tribal partners to identify in-stream flows necessary to meet critical resource needs, including values related to the subject segment(s). Such quantifications will be included in any recommendation for designation.	X				
WSR-8	BLM will then seek to jointly promote innovative strategies, community-based planning, and voluntary agreements with water users, under State law, to address those needs.	X				
WSR-9	Should designations occur on any river segment as a result of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Secretarial or congressional action, existing rights, privileges, and contracts will be protected. Under Section 12 of the Act, termination of such rights, privileges, and contracts may happen only with the consent of the affected non-federal party. A determination by the BLM of eligibility and suitability for the inclusion of rivers on public lands to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System does not create new water rights for the BLM. Federal reserved water rights for new components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System are established at the discretion of Congress. If water is reserved by Congress when a river component is added to the Wild and Scenic rivers System, it will come from water that is not appropriated at the time of designation, in the amount necessary to protect features which led to the river's inclusion into the system. BLM's intent					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	will be leave existing water rights undisturbed and to recognize the lawful rights of private, municipal and state entities to manage water resources under state law to meet the needs of the community. Federal law, including Section 13 of the Act and the McCarren Amendment (43 U.S.C. 666), recognizes state jurisdiction over water allocation in designated streams. Thus, it is BLM's position that existing water rights, including flow apportioned to the State of Utah interstate agreements and compacts, including the Upper Colorado River Compact, and developments of such rights will not be affected by designation or the creation of the possible federal reserved water right. BLM will seek to work with upstream and downstream water users and applicable agencies to ensure that water flows are maintained at a level sufficient to sustain the values					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	for which affected river segments were designated.					
WSR-10	Designate Colorado River Segment 2 – (Westwater Canyon from Mile 125 to River Mile 112) as suitable for recommendation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Wild”.	X				
WSR-11	Designate Colorado River Segment 3(a) – (River Mile 112 to Cisco Wash) as suitable for recommendation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Scenic”.	X				
WSR-12	Designate Colorado River Segment 3(b) – (Cisco Wash to the confluence of the Colorado with the Dolores River) as suitable for recommendation into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Recreational”.	X				
WSR-13	Designate Colorado River Segment 4 – (Confluence of the Colorado with the Dolores River to Mile 49 near Potash) as	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Recreational”.					
WSR-14	Designate Colorado River Segment 5 – (Mile 44.5 to Mile 38.5) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Scenic”.	X				
WSR-15	Designate Colorado River Segment 6 – (Mile 37.5 to 34 at the Canyonlands National Park boundary) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Scenic”.	X				
WSR-16	Designate Dolores River Segment 1 – (Colorado State line to Fisher Creek) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Recreational”.	X				
WSR-17	Designate Dolores River Segment 2 – (Fisher Creek to Bridge Canyon) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Scenic”.					
WSR-18	Designate Dolores River Segment 3 – (Bridge Canyon to the Colorado River) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Recreational”.	X				
WSR-19	Designate Green River Segment 1 – (Coal Creek to Nefertiti Boat Ramp) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification “Wild”.	X				
WSR-20	Designate Green River Segment 2 – (Nefertiti Boat Ramp to Swasey’s Boat Ramp) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Recreational”.	X				
WSR-21	Designate Green River Segment 4(a) – (Mile 97 at the confluence with the San Rafael River to Canyonlands National Park boundary) as suitable for recommendation into the Wild	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and Scenic Rivers System with a classification of “Scenic”.					
WSR-22	The suitability of Salt Wash is deferred until the National Park Service does its suitability study on the portion of Salt Wash that is within Arches National Park. Salt Wash remains eligible and is managed to protect its outstandingly remarkable values, free-flowing nature, and tentative classification. By default, the lower 0.25 miles of this 0.3 mile segment is within Segment 4 of the Colorado River. Consequently, it is managed as suitable with a “recreation” classification.	X				
DW-1	Manage Black Ridge Wilderness Area (5,200 acres; part of the McInnis Canyon National Conservation Area) in accordance with applicable law, regulation, policy, and management for the area (see Map 23).	X				
DW-2	For designated Wilderness, any new development or surface	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	disturbance is for wilderness purposes, and the lands are closed to mineral leasing and location. These are non-discretionary, non-planning decisions.					
DW-3	Designate Black Ridge Wilderness Area as VRM I.	X				
DW-4	Manage Black Ridge Wilderness Area as closed to motorized travel.	X				
WSA-1	Manage WSAs under the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (IMP; USDI-BLM 1995; see Map 23). Manage for the continued preservation of each WSA's wilderness character.		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.
WSA-2	For WSAs, no surface disturbance, permanent new development, or ROWs are allowed, and the lands are closed to oil and gas leasing (see Appendix A).		X			Add after oil and gas leasing: <i>"subject to leases with valid, existing rights."</i>
WSA-3	Only Congress can release a WSA from wilderness consideration. Should any WSA, in part or in whole, be released from wilderness consideration,		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	proposals in the released area will be examined on a case-by-case basis. All proposals inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the Approved RMP will be deferred until completion of requisite plan amendments. Because a plan amendment will be required, there is no separate analysis in this Land-use Plan to address resource impacts if any WSAs are released.					
WSA-4	Fire activities and projects in WSAs will follow the IMP.		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.
WSA-5	Designate WSAs as VRM Class I.	X				
WSA-6	Under the Approved RMP, where routes will remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs – see Glossary) could continue as long as use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy for		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 7/5/95). The miles of motorized routes in WSAs (see below for miles of route per WSA) are only conditionally open to vehicle use. If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM will take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.					
WSA-7	Travel Management within WSAs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Behind the Rocks WSA (12,635 acres): Designate a portion of the Behind the Rocks WSA as closed to OHV use (11,822 acres). Designate OHV use in the 		X			Second bullet updated via maintenance action 39 and 40: 0.8 miles of route in Lost Springs WSA removed as a designated route from the travel plan (now 0 miles). Incorporate changes to updated e-version.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>remainder of the WSA as limited to designated routes (813 acres, with 0.9 miles of designated route).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Black Ridge (52 acres) and Lost Spring Canyon (1,624 acres) WSAs Designate Black Ridge and Lost Spring Canyon WSAs as limited to designated routes, with 0.8 miles of route designated in Lost Spring Canyon WSA and 0 miles of route designated in Black Ridge WSA. Desolation Canyon (81,603 acres), Floy Canyon (72,605 acres), Flume Canyon (50,800 acres), Coal Canyon (60,755 acres), Mill Creek Canyon (9,780 acres), Negro Bill Canyon (7,820 acres), and Spruce Canyon (20,990 acres) WSAs: (Acreage of Desolation Canyon WSA is for the MPA portion only. Remainder of this WSA is 					Recommend future change from “limited to designated routes with no designated routes” to “closed.”

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>managed by the Price Field Office. Acreage of Flume Canyon WSA includes 2,750 acres in areas administered by the Vernal Field Office.): Designate these WSAs as closed to OHV. No miles of route are designated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Westwater Canyon WSA (31,160 acres): Designate a portion of the Westwater Canyon WSA as closed to OHV (23,690 acres). Designate the remainder of the WSA as limited to designated routes, with no miles of route designated. 					
SSS-1	As required by the Endangered Species Act, implement recovery actions identified in Recovery Plans and in Conservation Agreements, Plans and Strategies in coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR), and other interested entities. The BLM will	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	be an active participant in all recovery implementation teams.					
SSS-2	As required by the Endangered Species Act, the protection of habitat for listed and non-listed plant and animal species will be considered prior to authorizing any actions that could alter or disturb such habitat.	X				
SSS-3	As required by the Endangered Species Act, no management action will be permitted on public lands that will jeopardize the continued existence of plant or animal species that are listed or are officially proposed or are candidates for listing as T&E.	X				
SSS-4	As required by the Endangered Species Act, surveys of habitat or potential habitat for special status species (including any sensitive species under consideration for formal designation as T&E) will be made prior to taking any action that could affect these species. Surveys will be conducted using protocols	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	established for potentially affected species.					
SSS-5	As required by the Endangered Species Act, BLM will conduct or cooperate in surveys to determine the extent of listed and non-listed plant and animal species and their habitat or potential habitat. Any listed or non-listed special status species survey must be conducted by qualified biologists, botanists, or ecologists that have been approved by the BLM.	X				
SSS-6	As required by the Endangered Species Act, monitoring, using approved protocol, will be required on listed and non-listed special status species habitat that may be affected by BLM authorization of any activities within that habitat.	X				
SSS-7	As required by the Endangered Species Act, follow current and future recovery plans and manage habitat for T&E and BLM Sensitive species:		X			Add YBCU & GUSG when they become available.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan. • Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan. • Humpback Recovery Plan. • Humpback Chub Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Humpback Recovery Plan. • Bonytail Recovery Plan. • Bonytail Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Bonytail Recovery Plan. • Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan. • Razorback Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan. • Black-footed Ferret Recovery Plan. • Northern States Bald Eagle Recovery Plan. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recovery Plan for the Mexican Spotted Owl. Recovery Plan Southwestern Willow Flycatcher. 					
SSS-8	As required by the Endangered Species Act, support and implement special status plant and animal Species Management Plans. Coordinate actions with UDWR and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring.	X				
SSS-9	As required by the Endangered Species Act, support and implement current and future special status plant and animal species Conservation Plans, Strategies, and Agreements. Coordinate actions with USFWS and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring. As of 2005, Conservation Plans Strategies and Agreements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Colorado River Cutthroat Trout Conservation Agreement and Strategy 		X			Add YBCU & GUSG when they become available.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Conservation Agreement for the Roundtail Chub, Bluehead Sucker and Flannelmouth Sucker (see Map 24).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow current and future Conservation Measures and Best Management Practices (BMP) for Federally Listed Species (see Appendix R). Species include but are not limited to: Jones Cycladenia, Mexican Spotted Owl, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, Bald Eagle, and the Endangered Fish of the Colorado River. 					
SSS-10	As required by the Endangered Species Act, work with UDWR to implement the Utah Wildlife Action Plan (UDWR 2005a) to coordinate management actions that will conserve native species and prevent the need for additional listings.	X				
SSS-11	As required by the Endangered Species Act, mitigate all	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	unavoidable habitat losses for special status species as required by policy or law.					
SSS-12	As required by the Endangered Species Act, avoid construction of new roads within listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species habitats.	X				
SSS-13	As required by the Endangered Species Act, apply lease notices for listed plant and animal species as determined by Section 7 consultation between BLM and USFWS. Apply appropriate lease notices for any non-listed special status plant and animal species that occur or could potential occur applicable proposed lease areas.	X				
SSS-14	As required by the Endangered Species Act, develop cooperative agreements with other agencies or entities to inventory and/or monitor existing or potential habitat for listed and non-listed special status plant and animal species.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-15	As required by the Endangered Species Act, plan and implement assessment and monitoring plans for T&E and BLM Sensitive species.	X				
SSS-16	As required by the Endangered Species Act, participate in the Colorado River Fishes Recovery and Implementation Program.	X				
SSS-17	As required by the Endangered Species Act, coordinate with USFWS and UDWR to allow for the reintroduction of T&E and BLM Sensitive species into historic or suitable range. These reintroductions will be analyzed with site-specific NEPA.	X				
SSS-18	As required by the Endangered Species Act, allow translocations and population augmentation of special status species to aid in conservation and recovery efforts. Implement necessary habitat manipulations and monitoring to ensure successful translocation efforts.	X				
SSS-19	As required by the Endangered	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Species Act, apply environmental best management practices (BMPs) to all oil and gas operations in accordance with WO IM 2007-021 and the latest version of the "Goldbook" (see Appendix A).					
SSS-20	Mexican Spotted Owl (MSO): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If BLM determines that a proposed action may affect MSO or its habitat, consultation with the USFWS will be initiated (see Map 25). • Monitor and protect known Protected Activity Center (PAC) sites according to USFWS recommendations and MSO Recovery Plan. • Manage habitat for MSO according to USFWS and UDWR recommendations and recovery plans. • Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies and entities to inventory and monitor 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>existing potential habitat and annually schedule assessment plans of MSO habitat to determine quality of habitat and presence of species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect occupied and potential habitat, including designated critical habitat for the MSO, by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A). These stipulations will preclude temporary activities within designated critical habitat from March 1 through 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	August 31. Permanent actions are prohibited year-round within 0.5 miles of a PAC.					
SSS-21	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (SWFL): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If BLM determines that a proposed action may affect SWFL or its habitat, consultation with the USFWS will be initiated. • Monitor and protect known nesting sites according to USFWS recommendations and SWFL Recovery Plan. • Manage habitat for SWFL according to USFWS and UDWR recommendations and recovery plans; avoid loss or disturbance of suitable riparian habitat. • Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies and entities to inventory and monitor existing potential habitat and annually schedule assessment 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>plans of SWFL habitat to determine quality of habitat and presence of species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect SWFL and their habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A) within suitable habitat. These stipulations will preclude activities within a 100-m buffer of suitable habitat year long. Activities within 0.25 miles of occupied breeding habitat will not occur during the breeding season, May 1 through August 15. 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
SSS-22	Bald Eagle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acquire lands with roost and nest sites through land exchange, purchase or donation. Conduct assessments of wintering bald eagle habitat to delineate essential winter habitat and to develop necessary protective measures. Monitor nesting territories annually during breeding season (generally January 1 through August 31). Protect bald eagle nest sites by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A) within 1.0 mile of documented nest sites (2,439 acres). These stipulations will preclude surface- disturbing activities within a 1.0 mile radius of nest sites from January 1 through August 31 (see Map 26). No permanent structures will be allowed within 0.5 miles of known bald eagle nest sites year-round. Deviations may be allowed only after appropriate levels of consultation and coordination with the USFWS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect bald eagle winter habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A) within 0.5 mile of winter roost areas. These stipulations will preclude activities and permanent structures within a 0.5 mile radius of winter roost sites from November 1 through March 31 (see Map 26). No permanent structures will be allowed within 0.5 mile of winter roost sites, if the structure will result in the habitat becoming unsuitable for future winter roosting by bald eagles.					
SSS-23	Greater Sage-grouse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement the most current UDWR Strategic Management Plan for Sage-Grouse (UDWR, 2002 and its future revisions), the BLM National Sage-Grouse 	X				Decision was updated via Maintenance Action 37. Incorporate changes to updated e-version.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Habitat Conservation Strategy (BLM, 2004) and recommendations from local sage grouse working groups to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore Greater sage-grouse populations and habitat. About 3,068 acres of potential habitat has been identified within the Moab planning area. There is no sage grouse occupation at this time. However, if occupation is identified, through coordination with UDWR, the following decisions will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All surface disturbing activities will be prohibited within 0.5 miles of Greater sage-grouse leks on a year-round basis - Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within two miles of 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Greater sage-grouse leks from March 15 to July 15 to protect nesting and brood rearing habitat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allow no surface disturbing or otherwise disruptive activities within Greater sage-grouse winter habitat (3,058 acres) from November 15 to March 14. <p>See Appendix A for oil and gas leasing stipulations, along with exceptions, modifications, or waivers.</p>					
SSS-24	<p>Gunnison sage-grouse habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement the most current UDWR Strategic Management Plan for Sage-Grouse (UDWR, 2002 and its future revisions), the Gunnison Sage-grouse Range-wide Conservation Plan (2005, as amended) and 	X				Updated via maintenance action 37. Incorporate changes to updated e-version.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>recommendations from local sage-grouse working groups to protect, maintain, enhance, and restore Gunnison sage-grouse populations and habitat. About 175,727 acres of potential habitat has been identified within the Moab planning area. There is no Gunnison sage grouse occupation at this time. However, if occupation is identified, through cooperation with UDWR, the following decisions will apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All surface disturbing activities will be prohibited within 0.6 miles of Gunnison sage grouse leks on a year-round basis. Within the 0.6 mile buffer, allow no permanent above- ground facilities or powerlines; prohibit or limit year-round construction of 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>fences and where opportunity exists, remove existing fences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Within four miles of a lek, avoid fence construction, overhead powerline construction, and aboveground structures that provide raptor hunting perches. Where fences are necessary, increase their visibility. Modify or remove fences to minimize sage-grouse mortality. <p>See Appendix A for oil and gas leasing stipulations, along with exceptions, modifications, or waivers.</p>					
SSS-25	<p>White-tailed and Gunnison Prairie Dogs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The White-tailed prairie dog and the Gunnison prairie dog are BLM and State sensitive species; 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>translocations of these species will be considered in suitable unoccupied habitats (see Map 28).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage both prairie dog species and their habitats in coordination with the UDWR. Apply habitat management guidance and population monitoring strategies as recommended in the newly developed multi-agency White-tailed and Gunnison's Prairie Dog Management Plan. • Develop cooperative agreements with other agencies to inventory prairie dog densities and identify suitable habitat for expansion. 					
SSS-26	<p>White-tailed Prairie Dog Habitat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage the contiguous 117,481 acres of historic habitat designated by UDWR. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) within 660 feet of active prairie dog colonies. This stipulation will preclude surface-disturbing activities within 660 feet of these colonies. No permanent above-ground facilities will be allowed within the 660-foot buffer.					
SSS-27	Gunnison Prairie Dog Habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage 10,700 acres of habitat designated by UDWR for Gunnison prairie dogs. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) within 660 feet of active prairie dog colonies. This stipulation will preclude surface-disturbing activities within 660 feet of these colonies. No permanent 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	above-ground facilities will be allowed within 660 feet of prairie dog colonies. Power lines will be avoided within prairie dog colonies; however in the event that power lines are required within colonies, raptor anti-perch devices will be required.					
SSS-28	Colorado River Endangered Fish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No surface-disturbing activities within the 100-year floodplain of the Colorado River, Green River, and at the confluence of the Dolores and Colorado Rivers will be allowed. Any exceptions to this requirement will require consultation with the USFWS. Restrictions on surface disturbance within this critical habitat will be developed through this consultation process (see 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Map 24).					
SSS-29	Golden Eagle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Known golden eagle nest sites will be protected according to the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act amended in 1978. Acquire lands with nest and roost sites through land exchange or acquisition. Conduct assessments of wintering golden eagle habitat. Protect golden eagle nest sites and habitat (12,902 acres) by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Species Act, Appendix A). These stipulations will preclude surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 miles of documented nest sites from February 1 to July 15 (see Map 26).					
SSS-30	Burrowing Owl: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protect burrowing owls by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS (see Appendix R) for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A) by precluding surface-disturbing activities within 0.25 miles of known nests from March 1 through August 31 (see Map 29). Domestic sheep camps, 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>temporary watering sites, and salt and mineral blocks will not be located within 0.25 miles of occupied burrowing owl nests from March 1 through August 31.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain ground squirrel and prairie dog colonies to provide habitat and nesting burrows for burrowing owls. • The species will be managed under the guidance provided by the Raptor Best Management Practices (BMPs; see Appendix R), which includes implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers to protect nesting raptors and their habitats. 					
SSS-31	<p>Kit Fox:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect kit fox by precluding surface-disturbing activities within 200 meters of a kit fox den. 	X				<p>Plan maintenance action 34 modified the decision: <i>Protect kit fox by precluding surface disturbing activities within 200 m of <u>an occupied</u> kit fox den. (Jan 2012).</i></p> <p>Incorporate changes to</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						updated e-version.
SSS-32	Ferruginous Hawk: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage ferruginous hawk nesting and foraging habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS (see Appendix R) for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A) precluding surface-disturbing activities within 0.5 miles of active nests from March 1 through August 1 (see Map 29). Domestic sheep camps, temporary watering sites, and salt and mineral blocks will not be located within 0.5 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>miles of occupied ferruginous hawk nests from March 1 through Aug. 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The species will be managed under the guidance provided by the Raptor BMPs (see Appendix R), which includes implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers to protect nesting raptors and their habitats. 					
SSS-33	<p>Yellow-billed Cuckoo:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoid loss or disturbance of yellow-billed cuckoo habitat and manage yellow-billed cuckoo nesting and foraging habitat by applying the standard terms and conditions developed in consultation with the USFWS for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Standard Terms and Conditions [Lease Notices] which are Required to Protect Special Status 		X			<p>Will need to be updated when recovery plan is available.</p> <p>FWS recommendations as of November 2014: Buffers need to be increase from 100 meters to 0.5 miles and nesting dates changed to 6/15-8/31. Current draft lease sale recommendations from FWS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat suitability within and/or directly adjacent to the parcel will be identified prior to lease development to identify potential survey needs. Protocol Breeding Season

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A). These stipulations preclude surface-disturbing activities within 100 meters of yellow-billed cuckoo habitat within riparian areas from May 15 through July 20.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with BLM Riparian Policy will restrict surface disturbance within 100 meters of riparian habitat and will therefore protect nesting habitat for yellow-billed cuckoo. 					<p>Surveys will be required in suitable habitats prior to operations unless species occupancy and distribution information is complete and available. All Surveys must be conducted by permitted individual(s), and be conducted according to protocol.</p> <p>3. Temporary or permanent actions, will require monitoring throughout the duration of the project to ensure that western yellow-billed cuckoo or its habitat is not affected in a manner or to an extent not previous considered. Avoidance and minimization measures will be evaluated throughout the duration of the project.</p> <p>4. Water production will be managed to ensure maintenance or enhancement of riparian habitat.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						<p>5. Where technically and economically feasible, use directional drilling or multiple wells from the same pad to reduce surface disturbance and eliminate drilling in suitable riparian habitat. Ensure that such directional drilling does not intercept or degrade alluvial aquifers.</p> <p>6. New roads, pipelines or powerlines will be sited outside a 300 ft. buffer of suitable habitat.</p> <p>7. Drilling and pumping pads will be sited outside a 300 ft. buffer from suitable habitat. Measures such as the use of hospital-grade mufflers and electric pumps or other suitable measures will be used to ensure noise levels at the edge of suitable habitat do not exceed baseline conditions.</p> <p>7. Drilling activities within 0.25 mile of occupied habitat</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						<p>will not occur during the breeding season of June 15 – August 31.</p> <p>8. Ensure that water extraction or disposal practices do not result in change of hydrologic regime that would result in loss or degradation of riparian habitat.</p> <p>9. Re-vegetate with native species all areas of surface disturbance within riparian areas and/or adjacent uplands.</p>
SSS-34	<p>Jones <i>Cycladenia</i> (<i>Cycladenia humilis</i> var. <i>jonesii</i>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require specific site inventories for all surface disturbing projects in areas with suitable <i>Cycladenia humilis</i> var. <i>jonesii</i> habitat. BLM will restrict activities, in suitable <i>Cycladenia humilis</i> var. <i>jonesii</i> habitat. Restrictions include limiting motorized travel to designated routes, 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	precluding surface disturbing activities within 300 feet of plants and suitable habitat, and precluding construction activities from May 15th through June 30th within occupied habitat (see Standard Terms and Conditions (Lease Notices) which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A). Other restrictions include avoiding road construction, land disposal, and utilities in this habitat, as well as avoiding grazing activities such as trailing, salting, watering and herding.					
SSS-35	California Condor: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within potential habitat for the California Condor, surveys will be required prior to operations unless species occupancy and 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>distribution information is complete and available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface disturbing activities will not occur within 1.0 miles of nest sites during the breeding season of August 1 to November 30 or within 0.5 miles of established roosting sites (see Standard Terms and Conditions (Lease Notices) which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act, Appendix A). • No permanent infrastructure will be placed with 1.0 mile of nest sites and within 0.5 miles of established roosting sites. 					
SSS-36 (new)	Navajo Sedge				X	<p>Add decision that covers this listed species.</p> <p>Sample language: <i>In areas that are known or suspected to be habitat for Navajo Sedge actions would be avoided or</i></p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						<p><i>restricted per the Standard Terms and Conditions (Lease Notices) which are Required to Protect Special Status Species and to Comply with the Endangered Species Act (Appendix A, Table A4).</i></p> <p>Add Navajo Sedge Lease Notice language from Monticello RMP (Appendix B) to Moab RMP Appendix A.</p>
TRV-1	Where routes will remain available for motorized use within WSAs, such use could continue on a conditional basis. Use of the existing routes in the WSAs ("ways" when located within WSAs – see Glossary) could continue as long as use of these routes does not impair wilderness suitability, as provided by the Interim Management Policy for Lands Under Wilderness Review (BLM 7/5/95). The 1.7 miles of motorized routes in WSAs are		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	only conditionally open to vehicle use. If Congress designates the area as wilderness, the routes will be closed. In the interim, if use and/or non-compliance are found through monitoring efforts to impair the area's suitability for wilderness designation, BLM will take further action to limit use of the routes, or close them. The continued use of these routes, therefore, is based on user compliance and non-impairment of wilderness values.					
TRV-2	BLM, in preparing its RMP designations and its implementation-level travel management plans, is following policy and regulation authority found at: 43 CFR Part 8340; 43 CFR Subpart 8364; and 43 CFR Subpart 9268.	X				
TRV-3	Provide opportunities for a range of motorized recreation experiences on public lands while protecting sensitive resources and minimizing	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	conflicts among various users. Identification of specific designated routes will be initially established through the chosen Travel Plan accompanying this RMP (see Appendix N) and may be modified through subsequent implementation planning and project planning on a case-by-case basis. These identified routes will be available regardless of other management actions. These adjustments will occur only in areas with limited route designations and will be analyzed at the implementation planning level. These adjustments will be done through a collaborative process with local government and will include public review of proposed route changes. Site-specific NEPA documentation will be required for changes to the route designation system.					
TRV-4	All areas are limited, open, or closed to motorized travel. Limit	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	travel by motorized vehicle on all lands administered by the MFO to designated routes, except for Managed Open Areas, and for areas that are closed to motorized travel (see Map 30; see Appendix N for Travel Plan development).					
TRV-5	BLM could impose limitations on types of vehicle allowed on specific designated routes if monitoring indicates that a particular type of vehicle is causing disturbance to the soil, wildlife, wildlife habitat, cultural or vegetative resources, especially by off-road travel in an area that is limited to designated roads.	X				
TRV-6	OHV access for game retrieval, antler collection and dispersed camping will only be allowed on designated routes (designated routes/spurs and have been identified specifically for dispersed camping; parking areas associated with dispersed campsites will be marked during	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	travel plan implementation). Adherence to the Travel Plan is required for all activities, except where otherwise explicitly permitted.					
TRV-7	Only designated roads and managed open areas are available for motorized commercial and organized group use (see Maps 2 and 3 for route designations).	X				
TRV-8	Where the authorized officer determines that off-road vehicles are causing or will cause considerable adverse impacts, the authorized officer shall close or restrict such areas. The public will be notified as to these closures and restrictions.	X				
TRV-9	Any routes that are not baseline routes will be signed "Closed" on the ground. Such routes will be considered as impacts to the area's natural character, and use of such routes will be considered cross country use and not allowed. Non-inventoried routes should be	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	rehabilitated.					
TRV-10	OHV Designations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> About 339,298 acres will be closed to OHV travel. About 1,481,334 acres will be limited to designated routes. Approximately 2,000 acres (White Wash Sand Dunes) will be open to cross country travel (see Map 30). 		X			Maintenance action to specify best location of fence for White Wash Sand Dunes open area.
TRV-11	Designated Routes – Motorized: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate 3,693 miles of motorized routes. Designate 313 miles for motorcycles (163 miles on inventoried routes and 150 miles on inventoried single-track). Designate a dirt bike route from Colorado State Line to Thompson (see Map 3), utilizing 9 miles of single-track designated above and 22 miles of inventoried Grand County roads. 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	These totals are reflected in the mileage under "designated routes."					
<i>Mountain Bike Travel</i>						
TRV-12	Provide opportunities for mechanized (mountain bike) travel on all routes open to motorized use.	X				
TRV-13	Prohibit new bike routes within non-WSA lands managed for wilderness characteristics or within hiking Focus Areas.	X				
TRV-14	Limit mechanized (mountain bike) travel to designated trails and managed routes for resource protection purposes. Routes that are no longer available for motorized travel may be converted to bike routes upon application of site-specific NEPA analysis.	X				
TRV-15	Manage approximately 11.2 miles of routes on the following trails for non-motorized use only: Jackson Trail, "Baby Steps," Hunter Canyon Rim, Portal Trail, Hidden Valley, and Porcupine Rim single-track section (Hidden Valley and Porcupine Rim Trails		X			Update IMP to new WSA manual: MS-6330.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	are subject to IMP).					
TRV-16	Identification of specific designated mountain bike routes will be initially established through the RMP process and may be modified through subsequent planning at the activity plan and project plan levels on a case-by-case basis. These modifications will be analyzed through site-specific NEPA.	X				
TRV-17	Design and implement up to 150 new miles of managed mechanized (mountain bike) trails. In addition, convert existing inventoried routes not designated for motorized travel to non-motorized use, where appropriate, and install appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage.	X				
TRV-18	Initially designate the following existing trails for mechanized (mountain bike) use totaling 11.3 miles; see Map 4): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fisher Mesa (in conjunction with USFS; 5.8 miles) 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pothole (on Amasa Back; 1.2 miles) • Rockstacker (on Amasa Back; 0.9 miles) • Lower Porcupine Singletrack (“LPS”; 1.4 miles) • Power line Trail (0.07 miles on public land) • Mill Creek Parkway Extension (0.16 miles on public land) 					
<i>Non- Mechanized Travel (Hiking and Equestrian)</i>						
TRV-19	Non-mechanized travel is not restricted on public lands except where limited or prohibited to protect specific resource values, provide for public safety or maintain an identified opportunity.	X				
TRV-20	Provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel on all routes open to motorized or mechanized use and manage routes identified to exclude motorized and mechanized use and provide opportunities for non-mechanized travel independent of motorized and mechanized routes.	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
TRV-21	Limit non-mechanized travel on specific lands to designated trails and managed routes for resource protection purposes.	X				
TRV-22	Manage 17 miles of routes on the following trails for non-mechanized use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amphitheater Loop • Fisher Towers • Negro Bill - There is no equestrian use allowed on the Negro Bill trail. • Corona Arch • Trough Spring Canyon • Anticline Overlook • Needles Overlook • Windwhistle Nature Trail • Mill Canyon Dinosaur Interpretive Trail • Copper Ridge Sauropod Interpretive Trail • Sego Canyon Interpretive Trail 	X				
TRV-23	Identify specific routes through the RMP process. These routes may be modified through subsequent planning at the RMP, activity plan,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	and project plan levels on a case-by-case basis.					
TRV-24	Work with equestrian groups to identify additional trails for equestrian and hiker use only. These trails will be designated based on site-specific NEPA analysis.	X				
TRV-25	Design and implement up to 50 miles of managed non-mechanized trail system consistent with the Travel Plan. Implement these new system routes largely by converting existing, low utilization roads to non-mechanized use and installing appropriate support facilities such as trailheads and route signage.	X				
TRV-26	Mark the following existing hiking trails: Castleton, Culvert-Goldbar Loop. Mark a new trail from Onion Creek to Amphitheater Loop.	X				
TRV-27	The following trails will be managed for equestrian use. Hikers will also be allowed on	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>these trails, but there will be no motorized or mechanized vehicles allowed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Onion Creek Benches (Colorado Riverway SRMA) • Ida/Stearns Gulch Equestrian Trail System • Castle Creek Equestrian Trail • Rattlesnake Trail above Nefertiti Boat Launch • Seven Mile Canyons • Red Rock Horse Trail (Ken's Lake to Johnson's Up-on-Top) 					
VEG-1	Utilize the BLM National Sage-grouse Conservation Strategy – Guidance for Management of Sagebrush Plant Communities for Sage-Grouse Conservation, when applicable, in the development and implementation of vegetation and land treatments, livestock manipulation techniques, fire projects, energy exploration and development and any surface-disturbing activity within sagebrush and sage steppe	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	communities.					
VEG-2	Sagebrush/steppe communities will be a high priority for wildfire suppression, emergency stabilization and fuel reduction to avoid catastrophic fires in these communities.	X				
VEG-3	Reclaim and restore up to 257,809 acres of sagebrush habitat and shrub-steppe ecosystems where appropriate in accordance with the BLM sagebrush conservation guidance. Reclamation/restoration will be undertaken in cooperation with the Utah Partners for Conservation and Development (UPCD) and may include removing surface material, re-contouring, spreading topsoil, seeding or planting seedlings, and/or changing livestock grazing strategies, such as, changing season of use, type of use, removing or reducing spring grazing, reducing livestock numbers, reducing grazing intensity, improving distribution,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	requiring rest rotation practices, or exclusion. Work in coordination with UDWR to reduce wildlife numbers, as necessary, to restore sagebrush habitat.					
VEG-4	Provide opportunities for seed gathering of various vegetation types while protecting other resources.	X				
VEG-5	Restoration and rehabilitation will use native seed-mixes wherever possible. Non-native species may be used as necessary for stabilization or to prevent invasion of noxious or invasive weed species.	X				
VEG-6	Gather necessary vegetation information and continue monitoring to assess if planning objectives are being met.	X				
VEG-7	Utilize the techniques and methods for vegetation treatments identified in the Utah ROD for Vegetation Treatments using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Seventeen Western States (2007).					
VEG-8	Control noxious weed species and prevent the infestation and spread of invasive species. Develop cooperating agreements with other Federal, State, local and private organizations to control invasive and noxious weed species.	X				
VEG-9	Reduce tamarisk and Russian olive where appropriate using allowable vegetation treatments. Restore riparian habitat to native willow and cottonwood communities.	X				
VEG-10	Where appropriate, replant cottonwoods and willow subsequent to wildland fire or other disturbance in riparian areas.	X				
VEG-11	Promote science and research opportunities in the San Arroyo Area/Exclosures, Sagers Watershed Area/Exclosures and Big Flat Area/Exclosures (approximately 300 acres each).	X				
VEG-12	Establish Lower South Fork of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Seven Mile Canyon as a Riparian/Wetland Demonstration Area for the improvement and restoration of the riparian area.					
VEG-13	Insect pests will be treated in coordination with the State of Utah, other Federal agencies, affected counties, adjoining private land owners and other directly affected interests.	X				
VEG-14	See Livestock Grazing for other vegetation treatments.	X				
VEG-15	<p>Adaptive Drought Management: Establish criteria for restricting activities during drought (see Appendix T for Drought Classification System) based on the following measures/parameters:</p> <p><u>Severe (D2):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Send drought letters. - UDWR coordination for big game herd control. - Prepare local seasonal precipitation graphs. - Suspend or limit seed 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>collecting activities.</p> <p><u>Extreme (D3):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No new surface-disturbing activities in areas with sensitive soils (subject to valid existing rights or actions associated with other valid permitted activities; see oil and gas Appendix A for definition of surface-disturbing activities). - Changes in livestock use will be based on site-specific data on those allotments that are affected by drought. - OHV use and competitive motorized events will be confined to designated roads and routes within the open OHV area. - Require additional erosion-control techniques/BMPs for 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>surface-disturbing activities (e.g., hydromulching).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limit prescribed burns and vegetation treatments. <p><u>Exceptional (D4):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes in livestock use will be based on site-specific data on those allotments that are affected by drought. - No new surface-disturbing activities (subject to valid existing rights or actions associated with other valid permitted activities). - Consider closing areas to public entry. 					
VEG-16	Avoid or minimize to the extent possible the loss of sagebrush/steppe habitat from BLM-initiated or authorized actions. The BLM recommends that loss of sagebrush/steppe habitat essential to wildlife (e.g.,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	sage-grouse, mule deer, and sagebrush obligate species) be reclaimed or mitigated off-site.					
VRM-1	WSAs and designated wilderness are designated as VRM Class I.	X				
VRM-2	Wild and Scenic River (WSR) segments recommended as suitable for Wild are designated as VRM Class I, Scenic segments are designated as VRM Class II, and Recreational segments are managed the same as the underlying VRM management class.	X				
VRM-3	For all VRM classes, all resource uses and management activities are required to meet VRM objectives. However, recreation developments in the immediate foreground of Key Observation Points (KOPs) in VRM Class I and II areas require special consideration to meet both recreational and VRM objectives. These facilities often create more contrast than would be acceptable; however this	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	contrast is allowed if the facilities are part of the expected image held by the public being served. The contrast should be allowed only to the extent needed for the function of the facility, which should reflect design excellence and be a positive element of the built environment. Structures should blend into the landscape while retaining functionality.					
VRM-4	Apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) in all areas designated as VRM Class I.	X				
VRM-5	Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) to all areas designated as VRM Class II. This requires surface-disturbing activities to meet the objectives of VRM Class II.	X				
VRM-6	Designated utility corridors within VRM Class II areas are designated	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	as VRM Class III only for utility projects.					
VRM-7	Necessary road maintenance could occur regardless of VRM class.	X				
VRM-8	Public lands within the viewshed of Arches National Park are designated as VRM Class II.	X				
VRM-9	Designated VRM management classes are displayed on Map 31.	X				
VRM-10	Areas with high potential for development of oil and gas (Big Flat/Hatch Point/Lisbon Valley, and Eastern Bookcliffs/Greater Cisco) will be designated as VRM Class III with the exception of those portions of SRMAs and ACECS that have more stringent VRM classifications.		X			There is more recreational use in some of the listed areas. Additionally, new VRI information is now available to be considered in a plan amendment process. There are an additional 150,000 acres of VRI II. When the new VRI information is considered in a planning process, this decision should also be revisited.
VRM-11	Manage the Shafer Basin portion of the Highway 279/Shafer Basin/Long Canyon ACEC as VRM Class I.	X				
VRM-12	Scenic driving corridors will be designated as VRM Class II		X			This decision may be modified for the Moab MLP

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	within a specified viewshed not to exceed 0.5 mile from centerline. Apply a controlled surface use stipulation for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A) within 0.5 mile of scenic driving corridors.					planning area with regard to oil and gas stipulations that would be applied within scenic driving corridors. Revisit when the Record of Decision for the Moab MLP is approved and ensure any change is reflected in the RMP.
VRM-13	<p>Manage the following areas with high-quality visual resources as VRM Class II (see Map 31):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sand Flats • Gemini Bridges/Monitor and Merrimac/Poison Spider/Goldbar/ Corona Arch area • The Colorado, Dolores and Green River corridors • Tusher Canyon (Bookcliffs) • The Colorado Riverway • Matt Martin Point • Areas bordering Arches National Park • Kane Creek • Hatch Wash • The rims of Canyon Rims 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Mill Creek and Behind the Rocks ACECs Beaver Creek Long Canyon 					
VRM-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designate 358,911 acres as VRM Class I. Designate 365,566 acres as VRM Class II. Designate 829,158 acres as VRM Class III. Designate 268,133 acres as VRM Class IV. 		X			New VRI information is available and should be considered in a plan amendment process.
WL-1	<p>Habitat Management Plans: Continue to implement and modify three Habitat Management Plans (HMPs) summarized in Appendix U: Hatch Point HMP, Dolores Triangle HMP, and the Potash-Confluence HMP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hatch Point HMP: Manage to benefit pronghorn and improve sagebrush habitat for sage- grouse and other wildlife species. Emphasize habitat management, change in livestock class from sheep 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>to cattle, and maintenance of land treatments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potash-Confluence HMP: Manage to benefit desert bighorn sheep, but also include guidance for chukar partridge, bald eagle, and peregrine falcon. Water developments to benefit desert bighorn are to be maintained; under this HMP, 278,000 acres of land administered by the BLM are to be maintained in good condition and habitat is to be improved where needed. Eight specific management objectives were established (see Appendix U for details). • Dolores Triangle HMP: Manage to benefit deer, elk, and bighorn sheep. Improve bald eagle, riparian and native and naturalized fish habitat through the installation of fencing and enclosures in Granite, 					

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	Coates, Ryan, and Renegade Creeks by installing six in-stream structures (see Appendix U for details).					
WL-2	<p>Livestock grazing will not be authorized on the following allotments/areas (or portions of allotments/areas) in order to benefit wildlife resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A portion of the Kane Spring Allotment (that portion in Kane Spring Canyon between the open valley and the river; 558 acres and 0 AUMs) • An area along the Colorado River between Hittle and north of Dewey Bridge (400 acres, AUMs will remain the same) • Between The Creeks with 3,960 acres and 221 AUMs • North Sand Flats with 5,860 acres and 798 AUMs • South Sand Flats with 10,209 acres and 592 AUMs 		X			Add " <i>Bottom Cattleguard</i> " after Hittle to clarify.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A portion of Arth's Pasture Allotment (Poison Spider area; approximately 6,200 acres and 425 AUMs). 					
WL-3	Support and implement current and future animal species Conservation Plans, Strategies and Agreements. Coordinate actions with UDWR and other involved entities. Support population and habitat monitoring.	X				
WL-4	Migratory Birds: Executive Order 13186, "Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds," will be integrated into all activities with potential adverse impacts, wildlife management programs, and other resources including but not limited to riparian-wetland habitat, rangeland health standards and guidelines raptor protection, fire, special status species, off-site mitigation and habitat enhancement. Management actions will emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	"Birds of Conservation Concern" (2002f or as updated) and Utah Partners-in-Flight priority species. Habitats that will be emphasized are the Cisco Desert Bird Habitat Conservation Area, Colorado and Dolores River Bird Habitat Conservation Area, Green River Bird Habitat Conservation Area, and the Cottonwood and Willow Creek Bird Habitat Conservation Area (see Appendix U). As a supplement to complying with Executive Order 13186, the Bird Habitat Conservation Areas identified in the Coordinated Implementation Plan for Bird Conservation in Utah (Martinsen et al. 2005 or as updated), will receive priority for conducting bird habitat conservation projects, through cooperative funding initiatives such as the Intermountain West Joint Venture.					
WL-5	Migratory Birds: Implement Executive Order 13186,	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	"Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds" during all activities to protect habitat for migratory birds. Management will emphasize birds listed on the current USFWS "Birds of Conservation Concern" (2002 or as updated) and Partners-in-Flight priority species (as updated).					
WL-6	Migratory Birds: As specific habitat needs and population distribution to "Birds of Conservation Concern" and Partners-in-Flight priority species are identified, BLM will use adaptive management strategies to further conserve habitat and avoid impacts to these species.	X				
WL-7	Migratory Birds: Prioritize the maintenance and/or improvement of lowland riparian, wetlands, and low and high desert scrub communities which are the four most important and used habitat types by migratory birds in MPA.	X				
WL-8	Migratory Birds: Prevent the	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	spread of invasive and non-native plants, especially cheatgrass, tamarisk, and Russian olive. Strive for a dense under story of native species in riparian areas with a reduction in tamarisk and improvement of cottonwood and willow regeneration.					
WL-9	Migratory Birds: During nesting season for migratory birds (May 1 – July 31), avoid surface-disturbing activities and vegetative-altering projects and broad-scale use of pesticides in identified occupied migratory bird habitat.		X			FWS now recommending April 1 – July 31.
WL-10	Coordinate with UDWR and other partners to help accomplish the population and habitat goals and objectives of big game Herd Management Plans that are consistent with and meet the goals and objectives of this land-use plan.	X				
WL-11	The BLM will approach compensatory mitigation on an “as appropriate” basis where it	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	can be performed onsite, and on a voluntary basis where it is performed offsite, or, in accordance with current guidance.					
WL-12	Restrict dispersed camping in riparian areas to protect riparian wildlife habitat. Restrictions could include limiting camping to designated sites or prohibiting camping.	X				
WL-13	Implement a limited fire suppression policy and initiate prescribed fires where treatment by fire will increase vegetation productivity and increase forage for wildlife.	X				
WL-14	Modify the grazing season of use or change class of livestock for individual allotments as necessary to accommodate forage needs for wildlife.	X				
WL-15	Predator management will continue to be coordinated with Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)-Wildlife Services and UDWR and will be conducted utilizing	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	the guidance provided by the existing MOU with APHIS-Wildlife Services.					
WL-16	BLM will continue to coordinate with, and provide support to UDWR for introduction/reintroduction of native or naturalized fish or wildlife species into historic or suitable habitats as determined appropriate.	X				
WL-17	Introduction, transplantation, augmentation and re-establishment of both naturalized and native species will be considered and will include, but may not be limited to, pronghorn, desert bighorn sheep, wild turkey, bison, beaver, chukar, otter, and Colorado River cutthroat trout and other native and naturalized fish species, pursuant to guidance and direction provided in BLM's 1745 Manual.	X				
WL-18	Raptors will be managed under the auspices of Best Management Practices (BMPs; see Appendix	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	R), which will include implementation of spatial and seasonal buffers. These BMPs implement the USFWS's Guidelines for Raptor Protection From Human and Land-use Disturbances, with modifications allowed as long as protection of nests is ensured. Seasonal and spatial buffers are also listed in Appendix R. Cooperate with utility companies to prevent electrocution of raptors. Temporarily close areas (amount of time depends on the species) near raptor nest to rock climbers or other activities if the activity could result in nest abandonment.					
WL-19	Support and implement where possible the Northern River Otter Management Plan; coordinate with UDWR to determine potential release sites; support population monitoring.	X				
WL-20	Manage riparian areas to ensure a multi-aged, multi-layered structure, allowing for retention of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	snags and diseased trees. Provide multiple layers of vegetation (vertical structure) within 10 feet of the ground.					
WL-21	Minor adjustments to crucial wildlife habitat boundaries periodically made by the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) will be accommodated through plan maintenance.	X				
WL-22	<p>Pronghorn Habitat: Manage 78,476 acres of current pronghorn habitat that UDWR has designated in the La Sal (Hatch Point Herd) Wildlife Management Unit. Implement the Hatch Point HMP. Manage 743,524 acres of pronghorn habitat that UDWR has designated in the Cisco Desert and on the following allotments (see Map 32):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cisco • Cisco Mesa • Harley Dome • San Arroyo • Horse Canyon • Pipeline 		X			<p>Note: global search for Harley Dome, add Little Hole and San Arroyo where needed.</p> <p>Update to match Nov 2014 DWR shape files: Remove Harley Dome, Squaw Park, and San Arroyo (listed twice).</p> <p>Update acres accordingly: 79,700 acres in La Sal WMU. 548,579 acres in Cisco.</p> <p>Update Map 32 accordingly.</p>

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Floy Creek • Athena • Little Grand • Corral Wash Canyon • Agate, Little Hole • Monument Wash • Highlands • 10-Mile Point • Big Flat • Ruby Ranch • Bar-X • Crescent Canyon • Squaw Park • San Arroyo 					
WL-23	<p>Pronghorn Habitat: Management of pronghorn habitat (see Map 32) will be done in coordination with UDWR and may include (but will not be limited to) the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install and improve year-round water resources within the La Sal Management Unit and the Cisco Desert Herd unit. • Support a change in class of livestock from sheep to cattle 	X				Map 32 to be updated as noted in WL-22.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>on the Hatch Point area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in class of livestock from cattle to sheep will not be allowed within pronghorn habitat. • Install water developments every 2 square miles on summer and fawning areas. • Construct fences that allow for pronghorn passage. • Dismantle un-needed fences. • Install restrictive fencing to stop pronghorn passage onto highways. • Increase forage through vegetation treatments on approximately 4,400 acres. 					
WL-24	<p>Pronghorn Habitat: Protect pronghorn fawning habitat (293,741 acres) within Cisco Desert and on Hatch Point (the La Sal Wildlife Management Units) by applying a timing limitation stipulation that will preclude surface-disturbing activities from May 1 to June 15 (see Appendix A).</p>		X			Update acres to match Nov 2014 DWR shape files: 622,280.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL-25	Pronghorn Habitat: Spring grazing will be adjusted on a case-by-case basis on 188,975 acres on allotments within crucial pronghorn habitat in the Cisco Desert to encourage forb production. These allotments include Athena, Cisco, Cisco Mesa, Harley Dome, and San Arroyo.	X				Remove <i>Harley Dome</i> , add <i>Little Hole</i> . Update acres to 543,189.
WL 26	Pronghorn Habitat: Develop, where applicable, a rest/rotation of pasture or other grazing management systems within allotments that have crucial pronghorn habitat to encourage forb production prior to fawning. Change in livestock class from sheep to cattle, fencing, seeding and rest/rotation to improve habitat will be encouraged.	X				
WL-27	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Film permits will comply with minimum impact criteria (see Appendix H) from April 1 through June 15 and from October 15 through		X			Note: Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after Moab MLP Record of Decision is approved and update map via maintenance as needed.

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	December 15 within 123,490 acres of crucial bighorn sheep habitat (see Map 9).					Update Map 9 to match 2013 DWR shape files.
WL-28	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: No change in class of livestock from cattle to sheep conversions are to be considered in recognized bighorn habitat. (see Maps 9 and 10).		X			Note: Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after Moab MLP Record of Decision is approved and update map via maintenance as needed. Update Map 9 to match 2013 DWR shape files.
WL-29	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Follow the recommendations found in the BLM Bighorn Sheep Rangeland Management Plan, as revised (1993b); the Utah BLM Statewide Desert Bighorn Sheep Management Plan, as revised (1986a); and the Revised Guidelines for the Management of Domestic Sheep and Goats in Native Wild Sheep Habitats (BLM 1998a).	X				Add at end: <i>“or most current guidance”</i> .
WL-30	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Support the current bighorn sheep population and manage to increase desert bighorn	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	population (prior stable numbers) on 330,892 acres. Population goals will be reached by releases, by reestablishment, and through change of livestock class and installation of new water facilities (see Appendix U for details).					
WL-31	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Management of bighorn sheep habitat in coordination with UDWR will include: installing water developments every 5 square miles in or within 2 miles of escape terrain, precluding exotic ungulates, wild horses or burros within 10 miles of habitat, and constructing fences that allow for bighorn sheep passage (3 strands with bottom wire smooth) and dismantling un-needed fences.	X				
WL-32	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Manage 9,278 acres along the rim of Hatch Point as part of the Lockhart Bighorn Sheep habitat area. Apply a timing limitation stipulation to oil and gas leases and other permitted	X				Note: Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after Moab MLP Record of Decision is approved and update map via maintenance as needed. Update Lockhart Bighorn

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	uses, which will restrict surface-disturbing activities from April 1 through June 15 for lambing and from October 15 through December 15 for rutting (see Appendix A).					Sheep area to match 2013 DWR shape files.
WL-33	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Manage 317,523 acres of desert bighorn sheep habitat on the following grazing allotments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buckhorn • North River • Little Grand • Taylor • Ten Mile Point • Arth's Pasture • Spring Canyon Bottom • Big Flat • Kane Springs • Potash • Horsethief • Behind the Rocks • Ruby Ranch 	X				Note: Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after Moab MLP Record of Decision is approved and update map via maintenance as needed.
WL-34	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Support conversion of sheep AUMs to cattle on Hatch Point Allotment.	X				
WL-35	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Improve	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	desert bighorn habitat by installing and improving year-round water resources within all desert bighorn habitat and provide additional water sources at a minimum spacing of one water development in each 2 square mile area on lambing grounds.					
WL-36	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: To protect lambing, rutting, and migration habitat (101,897 acres), apply a no surface occupancy stipulation for oil and gas leasing and preclude other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A). Within migration corridors pipeline construction and geophysical exploration for oil and gas development will be allowed outside lambing and rutting periods from June 16 through October 14 and from December 15 through March 31, respectively.	X				Note: Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after Moab MLP Record of Decision is approved and update map via maintenance as needed. Update lambing/ rutting area to match 2013 DWR shape files to reflect the 107,220 acres now identified as lambing/rutting areas.
WL- 37	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Manage lambing areas (46,319 acres - see Map 9) with the following	X				Note: Boundaries may be amended by Moab MLP. Revisit after Moab MLP

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<p>prescriptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping is allowed only in designated campsites except for areas within the Green River riparian corridor, which remain open to unrestricted camping. No camping in Shafer Basin and Long Canyon. Livestock use will be adjusted on North River and, Taylor Allotments (Dry Mesa Pasture). 					<p>Record of Decision is approved and update map via maintenance as needed.</p> <p>Update lambing/rutting area to match 2013 DWR shape files to reflect the 107,220 acres now identified as lambing/rutting areas.</p>
WL- 38	<p>Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Manage 310,726 acres of currently occupied Rocky Mountain bighorn habitat from the Green River to Pipeline Canyon according to stipulations described in management common to all. This management includes improving or maintaining habitat and vegetative conditions to benefit bighorn sheep while maintaining or improving the ecological condition of rangelands (see Map 10).</p>	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
WL- 39	Bighorn Sheep Habitat: Support conversion of sheep to cattle on allotments that are within nine miles of the 310,726 acres of managed Rocky Mountain bighorn habitat. Once conversion occurs, do not allow re-conversion (from cattle to sheep). This includes the Cisco and Cisco Mesa Allotments, San Arroyo, Winter Camp and Harley Dome.	X				
WL- 40	Deer and Elk Habitat: Manage UDWR current deer habitat of 534,329 acres in the Bookcliffs and 313,551 acres on the La Sal Mountains as mule deer habitat by improving or maintaining vegetative conditions to benefit both livestock and wildlife and by maintaining or improving the ecological condition of rangelands.	X				Updated via maintenance action 38B. Incorporate changes to updated e-version.
WL-41	Deer and Elk Habitat: Increase elk forage through vegetation treatments such as chemical, mechanical, and prescribed fire on approximately 40,000 acres of	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	elk winter range (see Livestock Grazing).					
WL-42	Deer and Elk Habitat: Manage crucial and high value deer and/or elk summer range (105,636 acres) within the Bookcliffs and La Sal Wildlife Management Unit by applying a timing limitation stipulation that will preclude surface-disturbing activities from May 15 to June 30 (see Appendix A; see Map 33).		X			Updated via maintenance action 38B. Incorporate changes to updated e-version. The newly created Round Mountain Allotment is located in Castle Valley on what was previously State land, which had a grazing permit issued by the State. The land exchange agreement recognizes all valid existing rights of the state lands exchanged and allows grazing to continue. This allotment is not part of the 6,074 acres described in this section. Grazing is in the Fall and Spring.
WL-43	Deer and Elk Habitat: All forage on acquired state lands in upper Castle Valley within crucial deer winter range will be allocated to deer.		X			The newly created Round Mountain Allotment is located in Castle Valley on what was previously State land, which had a grazing permit issued by the State. The land exchange agreement recognizes all valid

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
						existing rights of the state lands exchanged and allows grazing to continue.
WL-44	Deer and Elk Habitat: Protect deer and/or elk crucial winter habitat (349,955 acres) by applying a timing limitation stipulation for oil and gas leasing as well as other surface-disturbing activities (see Appendix A). (This includes 73,160 acres in WSAs, which are already closed to leasing.) This limitation will preclude surface-disturbing activities from November 15 through April 15.	X				Updated via maintenance action 38B. Incorporate changes to updated e-version.
WL-45	Allotments not available for grazing to benefit wildlife: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bogart with 14,751 acres and 209 AUMs • Cottonwood with 27,193 acres and 900 AUMs • Diamond with 19,112 acres and 588 AUMs • Ida Gulch with 3,624 acres and 112 AUMs • Pear Park with 14,202 acres 	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mill Creek with 3,922 acres and 137 AUMs • Portions of Professor Valley along Highway 128 					
FOR-1	Permits for harvest of woodland products will continue to be sold to the public, consistent with the availability of woodland products and the protection of sensitive resource values.	X				
FOR-2	As needed, designate private and commercial wood gathering areas for the following uses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firewood • Fence posts • Christmas tree cutting • Green wood cutting • Plant gathering for landscaping 	X				
FOR-3	Use woodland harvest to assist in managing woodlands to accomplish goals outlined in the Fire Management Plan.	X				
FOR-4	Prohibit public fuel wood gathering in riparian areas.	X				
FOR-5	Permit sustainable harvest (including cutting of green	X				

Appendix C: Plan Decisions Matrix

Decision #	Decision	No Change Needed	Modify Decision	Drop Decision	New Decision Needed	Remarks
	willows, squawbush, and cottonwoods) for Native American traditional ceremonial use. Additional areas may be closed to wood gathering and wood harvest as needed to protect sensitive resources.					
FOR-6	Follow national BLM Forest Health and Forest Management Standards and Guidelines to assess conditions and guide management actions for the forest and woodland resource.	X				
FOR-7	Provide for salvage harvest of wood in beetle-kill areas, when compatible with other resource objectives.	X				
FOR-8	Provide 1,168,988 acres for woodland harvest and wood gathering. See Map 34 for areas in which woodland harvest and wood gathering is prohibited (652,386 acres) to protect resource values.	X				